The Nation.

NEW YORK, THURSDAY, FEBRUARY 11, 1886.

The Week.

THE reported decision of the Cabinet, to answer the Bland resolution of inquiry about the Administration's silver policy by having Secretary Manning send to the House copies of his own report and the President's message, with the silver passages in each marked, is a dignified and ample response to Mr. Bland's unnecessary questions. The attitude of the Administration on the silver question is clearly enough defined already. What is not clear is the attitude of Congress, and especially of the Republican members who are supposed to have honest convictions upon the subject. For the childish purpose of annoying the President, they allowed the Bland resolution to pass by a large majority, thus giving the silver advocates the advantage of winning the first move in the contest, and the still greater advantage of seeming to have a large majority on their side. If the Republicans in both branches of Congress continue their present policy of doing only those things which are likely to embarrass and annoy the Administration, no matter if the public interests suffer thereby, they will have a protest from the country presently which will set them to thinking. It is of a great deal more importance at present to stop the coinage of silver than it is to split the Democratic party, and the sooner the Republican statesmen comprehend this fact, the better will it be for them.

In the Senate on Monday Mr. Eustis, of Louisiana, offered a resolution directing the Finance Committee to inquire concerning the treatment of silver at the New Orleans Sub-Treasury. Mr. Eustis said that the cashier of a national bank at New Orleans had written him stating that shipments of silver dollars had been made by banks in the interior to their correspondents in New Orleans, but the Sub-Treasurer at New Orleans had refused to receive the silver dollars on deposit, and that that refusal had been approved by the Treasurer of the United States. He had received information from another cashier of a bank giving the startling information that country merchants were refusing to receive silver dollars except at a discount. Mr. Chace, of Rhode Island, made the innocent inquiry whether country merchants were refusing to take silver dollars for debts or were refusing to sell goods for them. Mr. Eustis was unable to answer that query, but he understood that they were discriminating against silver dollars, refusing to take them except at a discount. Evidently something must be done to put a stop to this sort of thing. Since silver dollars are legal tender, and since the Government virtually redeems in gold at the custom-houses, we can see no reason why the country merchant should discriminate against them except that it costs him something to get them transported to New Orleans, New York, and other places where he has to pay his debts. A law of Congress compelling the express companies to carry them for nothing would apparently be the right sort of a measure for the crisis. It would be clearly unjust to compel the country merchant in the interior of Texas to take silver at par, and then pay $5 to $8 on every $1,000 to get them carted to the city merchant. Express companies are "organizations of wealth" which ought to be dealt with in a summary manner. The Sub-Treasurer in New Orleans, we venture to say, will be able to clear his skirts completely when the charges against him are investigated, but we have our doubts about the express companies.

The recent resolution of the Senate, that the Secretary of the Treasury should furnish it information concerning the origin, amount, and disposition of what is known as the "Conscience Fund," has had the effect of enlightening the country as well as the representatives of the country concerning a very dark and mysterious matter. It is fair to assume that Mr. Ingalls, who introduced the resolution, entertained the common notion that the aggregate amount of those remittances of which we see mention nearly every day in the newspapers, as "contributions to the 'Conscience Fund,'" must be at this time very great, and that these, being kept distinct from the beginning, could be made available in time of need for appropriations for Government purposes. It is quite likely that many have considered that this "fund" was not accounted for, that it was subject to little or no supervision, and that it consequently furnished much of the money with which corruption was practised during election times. We now know that it is not a "fund" at all, but simply a part of the money in the general Treasury, coming under the head of "miscellaneous receipts," just as do consular fees and the proceeds of sales of public lands. Under this head the Secretary of the Treasury has not failed annually to report the amount of money received from "persons unknown." These receipts amount to nearly a quarter of a million of dollars, and date back to 1827, though doubtless the greater portion has accrued since the war. Mingled with the receipts from other sources, these have of course been year after year appropriated by Congress for one purpose and another, and now the learned upper branch desires to be informed what has become of "the fund." The resolution is a striking commentary on Mr. Woodrow Wilson's remark, in his 'Congressional Government,' that our financial policy has not been to equalize receipts and expenditures, to subordinate everything to economical administration, but to make trades prosperous, and to hold the resources of the Government as incidental to the industrial investments of private citizens.

Senator Hoar's bill providing that Congress shall meet in 1887 and every other "odd" year on the first Monday in October, and in 1888 and every other "even" year on the second Monday in November, has been reported favorably from the Committee on Privileges and Elections, and ought to pass. The Constitution provides that "the Congress shall assemble at least once in every year, and such meeting shall be on the first Monday of December, unless they shall by law appoint a different day." After trying various other dates for the opening of the session, the first Monday in December was settled upon early in the history of the Government, and has been maintained ever since. At that time it was perhaps as good a date as could be selected, since it left three good months for the short session in the days when a Congressman went to the capital to stay until adjournment, and when Christmas was much like any other day in the almanac. But now the general observance of the holiday season, combined with modern facilities for travel, renders the early part of every session practically worthless, and the real work of the winter hardly begins before members return from the Christmas recess toward the middle of January—less than two months before the expiration of Congress in the short sessions. A bringing forward of the time of meeting to early October in the odd years, and to early November in the even years, will save even more time than the additional weeks represent, since members will go to Washington with the expectation of really attacking business before the holidays. The later date selected for the years of Congressional elections relieves the scheme from the objection of interfering with the time allotted to political canvasses, and there seems to be no valid ground for opposition to the change.

The Senate on Friday passed the bill for the admission of the southern half of Dakota as a State. The division corresponded almost exactly with party lines, all the negative votes being cast by Democrats and all the affirmative but that of Mr. Voorhees by Republicans. Partisanship of course ought not to enter into the decision of such a question, but it always does. Sometimes, however, it operates to the public advantage, as promises to be the case in the present instance. The Democratic House will refuse to ratify the action of the Republican Senate upon partisan grounds, but the result will be most fortunate upon public grounds. The movement for the division of the present Territory and the admission of the lower half as a State is the most anomalous and unjustifiable performance ever known in the history of the formation of States. In all previous cases a majority of the people of a Territory have declared by popular vote in favor of the erection of the Territory into a State. In this instance a scheme is pressed for the division of a Territory and the admission of half of it without the submission to the people of the fundamental question, whether they favor a division. The ambitious office-seekers of southern Dakota who are pushing this project, claim that a majority of the people in the Territory endorse their plan, but they have always opposed anything looking toward a positive expression of the popular will in the only way recognized under our system of government, by a vote of all the people. All other considerations aside, the pending measure ought to be defeated because there is no evidence that a majority of the Dakota people favor it; and until such evidence

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

is presented by a clear expression of opinion at the polls, it would be a violation of the principles of popular government for Congress to assume to interpret their will.

The *Times* of Thursday gives only one reason, besides its own assertions, for thinking the intervention of the Government necessary between the Pan-Electricians and the Bell Telephone Company, but unhappily this takes the form of a precedent which the *Times* itself apparently did not understand. Its contention is that, if you wish to have a patent cancelled for fraud, the Government must bring the suit. "Private parties," it goes on to say,

"however, may test the validity of a patent by compelling the patentee to bring a suit for infringement. But the failure of this remedy not only against powerful monopolies like the Bell Telephone Company, but against petty swindlers brazenly claiming patents they never got or owned, is demonstrated every day in forced compromises, in the abandonment of lawful rights because their defence and establishment would be extravagantly costly, and in the payment of blackmail under the name of 'royalties.'"

It then cites as an illustration of the superior effectiveness of the Government's remedy the Colgate case, in which the Attorney-General in 1867 brought, at the instance of the Western Union Telegraph Company, a suit against Colgate, as the assignee of one Simpson, to determine the validity of a patent for a gutta-percha insulator. The writer in the *Times* gives the history of the case, and then, with a fatuity which is happily rare, describes it as having ended, not in cancellation, but in—a compromise. The following passage deserves a place in *Puck:*

"Mr. Colgate, it appears, shrank from such a searching scrutiny of the validity of his patent, and speedily ended the proceedings by a compromise—just as the Bell Telephone Company compromised its suit with the Western Union Telegraph Company when it took on a too threatening look."

In other words, the proceedings terminated just as the suits brought by private parties are apt to terminate. We have ourselves no doubt whatever that the Pan-Electricians are now in pursuit of exactly what Colgate got. Consequently we are still left without reasons for believing Mr. Lamar's action wise and necessary, but are as open to conviction as ever. We think, however, the Pan-Electricians ought to get their case stated by a more powerful and mature hand than the writer in the *Times*.

A case is under argument in New Orleans at this moment which throws some light on the Pan-Electric movement. The Bell Telephone Company is there asking for an injunction to restrain the National Telephone Company from using its telephones. The defendants claim, in answer, that the Court should not entertain the application pending the attack of the Government on the validity of the Bell patent. We shall probably now see this plea put in all over the country, and, if it is found effective, the Bell Telephone Company would for two or three years be a prey to all comers, its stock lowered, and that of hundreds of rival claimants correspondingly raised. We do not mean to say that this is a reason why the Government should not interfere, but it is a reason why the necessity of its interference should be clear beyond question.

The most striking and encouraging fact in our politics to-day is the hearty support given President Cleveland in his reform policy by the South, as manifested by the utterances of the leading Democratic newspapers in that part of the country. With scarcely an exception the representative journals, like the Charleston *News and Courier* in South Carolina, the Savannah *News* in Georgia, the Jacksonville *Times-Union* in Florida, and the New Orleans *Picayune* in Louisiana, heartily sustain the President and vigorously condemn his assailants. The *Times-Union's* remark that "the efforts of the demagogues and dishonest partisans to hinder and embarrass him in his work will prove as abortive as their efforts to defeat his election," and the *Picayune's* declaration that "the Democratic leaders who oppose President Cleveland are guilty of party treason," are only samples of the current tone of discussion in such papers. It becomes plainer every day that the South believes in civil-service reform; and as the South, by the uniform testimony of Republican organs, controls the Democratic party, the discovery is of the highest significance.

Another thing which becomes plainer every day is that the only hope of blocking the great pension jobs, which claim agents and political demagogues are trying their best to push through Congress, depends upon the opposition of Southern Representatives and Senators. It is discouraging to find how many Northern Republican newspapers, which understand perfectly well the injustice and wrong of such vast schemes as the proposition to repeal the limitation as to the time ot filing applications under the arrears act, are encouraging Congress to pass bills which will take hundreds of millions out of the Treasury. With such encouragement, doubtless many Republicans who have previously opposed such schemes will follow the example of Senator Sherman, who has eaten his own words of two years ago and come out in favor of the arrears job, which he once truthfully declared had "no equity in it." Some Northern Democrats think that they can capture the "soldier vote" in their districts by championing these projects, and their votes, combined with those of most of the Republicans in the House, will come near to making a majority. The sole chance of defeating the jobbers is through a combination of the Southern Democrats with those Northern members of both parties who are above demagogism in this matter.

The recklessness of partisanship is strikingly illustrated in the flagrant misrepresentation of the President's course regarding the removals of officials, made by the Philadelphia *Press* in a leading editorial upon this subject. "*Thousands of men,*" it declares, "have been turned peremptorily out of office in the middle of their terms." The *Congressional Record* of December 18 contained a complete list of the appointments made by the President, with information in each case as to whether the appointee was to fill a vacancy caused by death or resignation, or to succeed an official who had been suspended. From this statement it appeared that the President had removed in all *only six hundred and forty-three* officials, divided among the departments as follows: State, 80; Treasury, 160; Post-office, 266; Interior, 76; Department of Justice, 61. As there are about 4,000 offices filled by Presidential appointment, it follows that the first Democratic executive in a quarter of a century had removed, during three-quarters of a year, less than one in six of the Republicans whom he found in office. However, it is perhaps no wonder that a Republican organ which remembers that Mr. Blaine removed an even larger proportion of the Republican officials under his special oversight in the consular service, during the brief period that he enjoyed full swing under President Garfield, should suppose that Mr. Cleveland must have turned out men by the "thousands."

It is always interesting to trace the development of a national habit. Among the "literary remains" of the Rev. Homer Wilbur, pastor of the First Church in Jaalam, which were collected in the "Biglow Papers" a score of years ago, is a reference to what that worthy divine styled "one of the most inexcusable weaknesses of Americans"—their habit of signing their names to what are called credentials. The Rev. Mr. Wilbur thus recorded an illustration of this weakness which had fallen under his personal observation:

"But for my interposition a person who shall be nameless would have taken from this town a recommendation for an office of trust subscribed by the selectmen and all the voters of both parties, ascribing to him as many good qualities as if it had been his tombstone. The excuse was that it would be well for the town to be rid of him, as it would ere long be obliged to maintain him."

In process of time, as the recent "Bernard Conroy, Esq." incident in Indianapolis shows, the recommendation business has been carried a stage further. The Selectmen of Jaalam tried to get their man appointed to keep him out of the poor-house, while the Governor and other leading Democrats of Indiana recommended that Conroy be given an office apparently because they thought that was the only way of keeping him out of the penitentiary, where he had been sent more than once as a private citizen. Unfortunately for Postmaster-General Vilas, no public-spirited citizen like the Jaalam pastor interposed and saved him from the necessity of revoking an appointment which never ought to have been made. Doubtless he and all the other members of the Administration, from the President down, are quite ready heartily to endorse the Rev. Mr. Wilbur's conclusion: "When I see a certificate of character with everybody's name attached to it, I regard it as a letter of introduction from the Devil."

The white Democratic taxpayers of Vicksburg are urging the passage by the Mississippi Legislature of a law overthrowing the present system of electing the city government by popular vote, and substituting the appointment by the Governor of a Mayor and Aldermen, because non-tax-paying Republican negroes are in the majority. Republican organs in Boston are profoundly shocked at such evidence of distrust of the people. And yet the Vicksburg plan is only an extension of the same principle which the Boston Republicans persuaded the Massachusetts Legislature to adopt last year, when they secured the passage of a law taking the appointment of Police Commissioners from the (Democratic) Mayor of the city and giving it to the (Republican) Governor of the State. The theory of home rule was definitively abandoned when the Massachusetts Republicans declared

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

that a Mayor chosen by popular vote could not be trusted to appoint the men who supervise the police force. It is only a step further to the position of the Mississippi Democrats that the system of securing a mayor and aldermen by popular vote ought to be abolished, and that the appointment of these officials ought to be vested in the Governor. Indeed, we should not be surprised any day to hear that such a change was advocated by those "respectable" but indolent citizens of Boston who decided a year ago that it was not worth while to work hard and elect a good Mayor, who could be trusted to appoint good Police Commissioners, when it would be so much easier to throw off the burden upon the Legislature and Governor.

There is an unpleasant suggestion of "hippodroming" in the course of the chess contest between Messrs. Steinitz and Zukertort. That the fortunes of the match should vary is not surprising; what is strange is that so many games should be lost and won by mistakes which, we are assured, would be unaccountable in the case of players of only moderate skill. These successive quite inexplicable mistakes, occurring as they do always just at the proper time to increase uncertainty as to the result, distinctly favor the betting "talent," and thereby are doubly unfortunate, to say the least. We would do no injustice to the players, who, for anything we know, may be the honestest men in the world, but it is a fact that the open history of the present match already excites suspicion of "professionalism," especially in view of such objectionable features as the very large stakes at risk and the undignified device of carting the game about the country. A great match rightly conducted would probably bring about a chess revival, of which there were indeed many signs at the beginning of this one, but already they have in great measure disappeared.

Society at Seattle, Washington Territory, is at last thoroughly convulsed by the attempt of its lawless element to expel the Chinese laborers. The civil authorities and the law-abiding classes have been driven to the extremity of firing on the mob and killing or severely wounding half-a-dozen of them. This, it is said, has produced a bitter feeling. We presume that it was not intended to soften previous asperities. The shooting did not begin soon enough. The proper time was months ago, when the first assault on the Chinese occurred. The only danger now is that some compromise will be effected with the rioters, which shall leave them all the substantial fruits of victory, and serve to convince them that they were right from the beginning, and that the law of the land is whatever an impromptu mass meeting of native hoodlums and unnaturalized foreigners choose to make it.

The London riot was the appropriate sequel to the demands of Mr. Chaplin and other Tory squires for what they are pleased to call "fair trade." This is the name under which "protection to native industry" masquerades in Great Britain. It teaches the destructive doctrine that Government can and ought to keep people employed at good wages. In the late electoral campaign Lord Salisbury lent his countenance and support to this theory, in a guarded manner, but with sufficient distinctness to be understood, in a speech to the electors of Southwark. The hint which he threw out was taken by the workingmen in earnest, and they accordingly waited upon him a few days ago and asked him to bring forward a measure to provide employment for them. Of course he could not answer their request in a satisfactory way, but was compelled to put them off with generalities and personal sympathy. All the materials for a "demonstration" were at hand, and it wanted only a leader to put the mass of suffering and discontent in motion. The leadership belonged naturally to the small knot of Socialists in London, because they know exactly what they want, while the others do not. The Socialists want immediate pillage and division of property. The British workmen want no such thing. They want honest work by which they can earn a living. There has never been any bond of sympathy between the so-called "International" society of the Continent and the laboring classes of England.

There was nothing more characteristic of the British mob, if this demonstration may be called such, than its voluntary dispersion after it had accomplished what it came together for—that is, after it had shown its numbers, held its meeting, and passed its resolutions. The breaking of windows and gutting of shops along the road was evidently the work of "professionals," who always attach themselves to any disorderly movement, and take advantage of the crowd and of the preoccupation of the police to fill themselves with liquor and to seize any portable property that comes in their way. If this had been a French instead of an English mob—if Paris, instead of London, had been the scene of disturbance—the streets would to-day be filled with barricades, the city would be in a state of siege, and the permanence of the Government, and even its form, would be endangered.

Mr. Gladstone is acknowledged even by his enemies to have been, under all the circumstances, remarkably successful in the composition of his new Cabinet. Mr. Chamberlain wished, report says, to be Chancellor of the Exchequer, but this would have alarmed as well as amazed "the City," where his schemes of taxation, as propounded during the last seven months, have been received with jeers and denunciation. He has therefore consented to take the Presidency of the Local Government Board, held in the last Cabinet by Sir Charles Dilke, while Mr. Mundella, a most estimable Birmingham manufacturer, who has given great attention to educational questions, becomes President of the Board of Trade—being another new recruit from the same quarter for the governing class. Lord Derby, now an acknowledged political failure, who made a dreadful mess of the Colonial Office in the last Ministry, is dropped out, apparently, altogether. Earl Granville, who was almost equally unlucky in foreign affairs, so much so that the prospect of his return to the same office is said to have made the Queen cry—deep interest in foreign politics being one of the traditions she has inherited from Prince Albert—takes the Colonies. He is a man of such genial manners, and has filled so many offices respectably, and has such a strong hold on the moderate wing of the Liberals, that, although he is over seventy, it was probably found impossible to shelve him entirely. Sir William Harcourt, who was Home Secretary under the last Gladstone Administration, now becomes Chancellor of the Exchequer. The ambition of his life has been to be Lord Chancellor, but he has of late years been so little of a lawyer that all prospect of seeing it gratified has probably passed away. Sir Henry James, who was Mr. Gladstone's last Attorney-General, would, in the ordinary course of promotion, have obtained the Lord Chancellorship, but he forfeited his claim by abandoning Gladstone and voting with the Tories in the recent amendment to the address. This has sent Sir Farrer Herschell, the late Solicitor-General, up one step, and has brought in Mr. Charles Russell as Attorney-General. Mr. Russell is a Catholic Irishman, the nephew of the President of Maynooth College, and, although not a Parnellite, a warm sympathizer with the Parnellites on the land question. He has been for some years the leader of the Common Law Bar in London. His appointment is a distinct recognition, as it would be called here, of the Irish element in the House of Commons.

Probably the most difficult place of all to fill was the Irish Secretaryship. Considering the fate which has overtaken the last three Secretaries—Mr. Forster ruined politically, Lord Frederick Cavendish murdered, and Mr. Trevelyan undoubtedly discredited—any Englishman in public life, however able or brave, might well shrink from taking the place. But if any Englishman can succeed in it, Mr. John Morley will. He has already, both as a journalist and member of Parliament, achieved distinct success in politics. He is a grave and weighty speaker, and, though not a sentimental man, has what we may call a philosophic sympathy with people of a different type of mind and character from the English, to the want of which the English failure in the government of Ireland has been largely due. He is favorable to home rule in some shape, and is ready to listen to what the Home-Rulers say, and consider it, and is not likely, when he gets to Dublin, to put on the "English gentleman" air which the Irish find so exasperating. On the whole, in fact, the new Cabinet is a considerable advance on its predecessor, as far as the Irish question is concerned especially.

The confidence of M. de Lesseps that the Panama Canal will be open for business within two or three years is simply wonderful. There is something almost sublime about the veteran engineer's anxiety to remove the business world's doubt regarding the completion of the work, "so that at the time of its inauguration shipowners and merchants may be ready to utilize it," and his consequent invitation to the leading commercial organizations to send delegates to accompany him on his tour of inspection. The New York Chamber of Commerce has done well to accept the invitation. There is probably no place in the world where people are so incredulous about the Frenchman's great scheme as in this city, but the public is interested in the project, and would be glad to know how it strikes a hard-headed American business man.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

SUMMARY OF THE WEEK'S NEWS.

[WEDNESDAY, February 3, to TUESDAY, February 9, 1886, inclusive.]

DOMESTIC.

THE Riddleberger and Pugh resolutions in regard to the relations of the Senate and President were tabled on Wednesday by a practically unanimous vote.

In the Senate in open session on Monday Mr. Sherman made a speech in which he held that any and all information on the files of any department belongs to the Senate. When the Senate met in executive session, the discussion broke out afresh, and was made lively when Secretary Manning's reply to the Morrill resolution was received. The resolution called for information regarding the removal of Internal-Revenue Collector McCormick, of West Virginia, and the reply of Mr. Manning is reported to have followed closely the tenor of Attorney-General Garland's refusal to furnish the papers in the Duskin case.

On Friday the Senate passed the bill for the admission of South Dakota as a State, Mr. Voorhees being the only Democrat who voted for it. The northern part is to be organized into a separate Territory named Lincoln.

Mr. Ingalls introduced in the Senate on Monday afternoon a resolution, which was adopted, directing the Finance Committee to inquire whether the statute cannot be amended so as to require the issue of $1 and $2 notes. In support of this resolution he said that he understood that these notes had been retired for the purpose of forcing silver into circulation; that no attempt had been made to force gold into circulation by the withdrawal of the $50 notes; that the people own the money in the Treasury, and want currency based upon gold and silver in circulation, and do not desire to carry coin in their pockets.

Senator Cameron (Rep., Pa.) introduced a bill on Monday to promote the foreign trade of the United States and encourage the increase of the American merchant marine. American vessels are divided into sections according to speed and measurement, and for each nautical mile run between a United States port and any foreign port, including outward and inward passage, they are to receive from the Secretary of the Treasury compensation ranging from 4 cents to 5 3-10 cents for each 100 tons United States gross register measurement. In part consideration for this, every vessel shall carry without further charges whatever mail matter is delivered to it, under regulations prescribed by the Postmaster-General, for the ports at which it expects to call. The compensation is to continue until 1905, and is then to be reduced 10 per cent. per annum of the rates given. All payments are to cease in 1915.

The Senate Committee on Foreign Affairs has reported that it is not advisable that a commission to consider the fisheries should be appointed. The Democrats of the Committee are said to have agreed with the Republicans upon this subject.

Mr. Hoar, from the Committee on Privileges and Elections, reported favorably to the Senate a bill fixing the time for the meeting of Congress in 1887 and every second year thereafter on the first Monday in October, and in 1886 and every second year thereafter on the second Monday in November.

In the House of Representatives on Wednesday the silver men showed their hands, the Coinage Committee having decided to try to get the subject in its own hands by reporting a resolution relating to the manner in which silver is treated at the New York Clearing-house. The resolution is the one calling upon the Secretary of the Treasury for information of various kinds. Mr. Hewitt moved to recommit the resolution, with instructions to report it back with the omission of the clause which calls upon the Administration to define its policy with respect to silver. Upon this a roll call was ordered, and it was defeated by 58 yeas to 168 nays. This is, however, not a test vote on the silver question. The original resolution, with two slight amendments, was then adopted by a *viva-voce* vote. The amendment modifies the strictures upon the Administration contained in the original resolution. The resolution was based upon the speech of George S. Coe, at the Bankers' Conference, relative to the policy of the Treasury in regard to silver. Mr. Morrison then reported from the Ways and Means Committee a resolution calling for information as to the total amount applied to the sinking fund between June 30, 1884, and July 1, 1885. This was adopted. The answer to these two resolutions will furnish the text for a debate on the silver question in the House.

The House on Thursday passed the Dingley Shipping Bill providing for the removal of certain fees, charges, and burdens on American vessels engaged in the inland and coastwise trade.

It is estimated that the total requirements for pensions in the next fiscal year will be $80,000,000.

The Civil-Service Commissioners on Wednesday held an informal conference with the House Committee on Reform of the Civil Service. In reply to questions as to whether it would be practicable to classify Government employees by work rather than by salaries, the Commissioners said that while it was practicable, classification by salaries seemed to them a better plan. They favored the appointment of a commission to rearrange the classification and salaries of department employees, and cited instances where the same work was paid for at different rates in different departments. The Commissioners said they thought it would require an amendment to the Civil-Service Law to allow the Commission in making appointments to take into consideration the number of employees already in office from various States. They did not consider such an amendment wise, however, as it would tend to render the whole civil-service system unpopular with the North and West, because under it the South would get nearly all the offices and thus open up a sectional question. Under the law the South was now getting its share of the offices, and would in time have its due proportion of them.

The Commissioner of the General Land Office has discovered that the Indian title to about 10,000,000 acres of land in North Dakota has not been extinguished, despite Secretary Teller's order in October, 1884, opening these lands, and their subsequent settlement by inhabitants of what may comprise fourteen or fifteen counties, most of which are organized. They contain 20,000 people, included in the Devil's Lake section, the Turtle Mountain district, and the Mouse River section. Commissioner Sparks says that in view of the presumption that the question will be submitted to Congress, he has decided to suspend all surveying contracts in the district in question indefinitely.

The suit which Secretary Lamar recommended the Department of Justice to bring to test the validity of the patent held by the Bell Telephone Company has been ordered by Solicitor-General John Goode. The lawyers who will assist the Solicitor-General are A. G. Thurman, the firm of Hunton & Chandler, of Washington, Mr. Grosvenor P. Lowrey, of New York, and C. S. Whitman, a patent lawyer. The firm of Hunton & Chandler is composed of Mr. Eppa Hunton, a former member of Congress from the Virginia district, and of Mr. "Jeff" Chandler, formerly of St. Louis. The Attorney-General will have nothing to do with the suit.

The following statement regarding the telephone controversy has been obtained as the result of a diligent search by an unprejudiced investigator: "At the time when Mr. Garland acquired his interest in the Pan-Electric Company all the stockholders, himself included, were not worth $10,000 together, and they are no richer to-day. The stock was never worth anything. He gave so little attention to it that he does not know even where his certificate is at the present moment. He would cheerfully give it to anybody who thought it worth taking. Certainly at the time when he acquired it nobody could have conceived that he (Garland) would ever be Attorney-General of the United States. Before Mr. Garland went home on his vacation last year he was approached by parties seeking to have a suit instituted in the name of the United States to set aside the Bell patent on the ground of fraud in its procurement. He replied that he could have nothing to do with such a suit, because he might be charged with an interest in its determination. He dismissed the subject from his mind, and was as much surprised as anybody in the United States when he learned that such a suit had been authorized by the Solicitor-General. If it is asked why Mr. Garland does not now divest himself of his interest in the Pan-Electric Company, the answer will be that in the present temper of his assailants, the most of whom are misled by one-sided statements and imperfect knowledge, such action on his part would be construed as an acknowledgment that he had done wrong, and in that frame of mind the public would never learn that he had been innocent from the beginning and all the way through. It is understood that Mr. Garland told the President long ago that if this adventitious circumstance were an embarrassment to him, the Attorney-General's resignation would be placed in his hands without a moment's hesitation. It is believed, however, that the President will not sacrifice an innocent man to misguided clamor in any case, but will trust to the slow development of facts for the vindication of his Cabinet."

Mr. William Dorsheimer, United States District Attorney for the Southern District of New York, has placed his resignation in the hands of President Cleveland. It will take effect as soon as his successor is named. It was Mr. Dorsheimer's intention, formed some time ago, to resign as soon as he was confirmed by the Senate. He found that his editorial duties on the *Star* seriously interfered with his official work, and it became a question which position he should vacate. He decided to retain his editorship.

A report is current in Kansas that the Knights of Labor are boycotting the State militia throughout the State. Several firms have been warned against employing militiamen.

The strikers in the coke regions of Pennsylvania caused serious trouble on Monday by attacking non-union workers.

Four hundred Chinamen were driven from their homes in Seattle, Wash. Ty., on Sunday by a mob, and the passage money for 100 of them paid on a steamer for San Francisco. No physical violence was done to them. The Chinese were prevented from sailing on Sunday night by a writ of habeas corpus. On Monday they were taken into court and informed individually by the judge that they could go to San Francisco or stay, as they wished. If they took the latter course they would be protected to the full extent of the law. About 195 in all took passage on the steamer. The several hundred remaining marched back to Chinatown escorted by the Home Guard. The mob attacked them, and the militia fired, wounding five men. This increased the bitterness between the mob and the order-loving citizens, and a serious outbreak is apprehended. The President has been called on by the Government for Federal troops. On Tuesday the President issued a proclamation ordering all people assembled for unlawful purposes in Washington Territory to disperse before 6 P. M. February 10. If the proclamation is not obeyed, the military will interfere.

Governor Hill on Friday nominated P. Henry Dugro, of New York, as Commissioner of Immigration. He has been a member of the State Legislature and Congress, and is Grand Sachem of Tammany Hall.

George T. Lanigan, a bright journalist author of the *World* fables, and at one time

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

editor of the Rochester *Post-Express*, died on Friday in Philadelphia, at the age of forty-one. He has recently been on the Philadelphia *Record* staff.

Dr. Alfred C. Post, a noted surgeon, died in this city on Sunday at the age of eighty. In 1851 he was appointed to the professorship of surgery in the Medical Department of the University of the City of New York, a position which he held at the time of his death.

Major-General Winfield Scott Hancock died at Governor's Island, New York Harbor, on Tuesday afternoon. He had been ill for some time with a carbuncle and diabetes. He was born February 14, 1824, and was graduated at West Point in 1844. In the Mexican war he served with credit. In 1861 he was made a Brigadier-General of Volunteers. He distinguished himself at South Mountain and Antietam, and, having been made a Major-General of Volunteers, led a division of Sumner's Corps at Fredericksburg and Chancellorsville. In June, 1863, he was appointed to the command of the Second Corps of the Army of the Potomac, and at the battle of Gettysburg, in July of that year, he commanded the Union left centre and was severely wounded in the repulse of Longstreet's attack on that part of our lines. The thanks of Congress were voted to him in May, 1866, "for his gallant, meritorious, and conspicuous share in that great and decisive victory." He was also engaged in the siege of Petersburg in 1864. His commission as Brigadier-General of the United States Army was received in August, 1864, and in March of the following year he was brevetted Major-General of the Army for gallant services at the battle of Spottsylvania. On July 26, 1866, he was commissioned Major-General, and at the time of his death he was the senior officer of that rank. For a number of years he has commanded the Department of the Atlantic. In 1880 he was defeated as the Democratic candidate for President.

FOREIGN.

The new British Cabinet was officially announced on Wednesday as follows: William E. Gladstone, Prime Minister and First Lord of the Treasury; Sir Farrer Herschell, Lord High Chancellor; Earl Spencer, Lord President of the Council; H. C. E. Childers, Home Secretary; Earl Rosebery, Secretary for Foreign Affairs; Earl Granville, Secretary for the Colonies; Earl of Kimberley, Secretary for India; H. Campbell-Bannerman, Secretary for War; Sir William Vernon-Harcourt, Chancellor of the Exchequer; Marquis of Ripon, First Lord of the Admiralty; Joseph Chamberlain, President of the Local Government Board; George Otto Trevelyan, Secretary for Scotland; A. J. Mundella, President of the Board of Trade; Mr. John Morley, Chief Secretary for Ireland. The following appointments have been made under the new Administration: Earl Sydney, Lord Steward of the Queen's Household; Mr. Arnold Morley, Patronage Secretary; Mr. Charles Russell, Attorney-General. Altogether the selections meet with favorable comment, except those of Earl Granville, the Marquis of Ripon, and the Earl of Kimberley. Earl Rosebery and Mr. John Morley are the striking features of the new Ministry. Both are the best possible selections, and are very warmly received.

The Earl of Aberdeen has been appointed Viceroy of Ireland, and Baron Wolverton Postmaster-General. The office of Lord Privy Seal has not yet been filled. It is reported that Earl Granville will soon retire from the Colonial Secretaryship and be appointed Lord Privy Seal; that Earl Rosebery will be transferred to the Colonial Secretaryship, and that Sir Charles Dilke will be appointed to the Foreign Secretaryship.

The following additional appointments under the new British Ministry have been officially announced: Chancellor of the Duchy of Lancaster, Edward Heneage; Lord Chancellor of Ireland, John Naish; Attorney-General of Ireland, Samuel Walker; Solicitor-General of Ireland, The MacDermot; Secretary to the Admiralty, John T. Hibbert; Under Foreign Secretary, James Bryce; Under Colonial Secretary, George Osborne Morgan; Under Secretary for India, Sir U. K. Shuttleworth; Under Secretary for the Home Department, Henry Broadhurst. The appointment of Mr. Broadhurst has caused a sensation in political circles, as he is the first workingman that has ever risen to the Ministry.

The Salisbury Ministry delivered their seals of office to the Queen on Saturday morning at Osborne. The Gladstone Ministry received them from her Majesty a few hours later.

Mr. Gladstone on Thursday issued an address to the electors of Midlothian. In it he says that there are three questions concerning Ireland which demand the attention of Parliament—the question of social order, the question of land reform, and the question of self-government. The desire for self-government, he says, must necessarily be subject to the law of imperial unity. The Government hope to find a safer and more effectual method than coercion to remedy the social troubles. The new Government will institute an inquiry into the entire land question in Ireland, and into the question whether there exists any necessity for the introduction of any specially coercive measures in legislation for the Irish people; but the main policy of the Government, the address declares, will be to endeavor to reach the source and seat of the mischief generally admitted existent in that country. The following sentence in the address indicates the character of the Irish policy decided upon by Mr. Gladstone: "Although the difficulties of the task make it impossible to anticipate success with confidence, we shall draw comfort from the knowledge that we are engaged in a great work of peace."

John Morley, in a speech at Newcastle on Monday, said: "This Ministry may fail. But the course upon which we are about to enter is the only course by which the problem can be solved. We may fall. We may fall soon. We may be a short-lived Government. But I hope, I am sure, when I think of the nerve and humor of the leader of the Ministry at this moment, that we shall not be a weak or wavering Government. A line will be fixed upon—has been fixed upon. Mr. Gladstone is not the man to leave it. He is not the man to take a great work in hand and then turn faint of heart. And I think he will find that some of his lieutenants are as resolute and as intent as he."

Messrs. Healy and Biggar arrived at Galway, Ireland, on Monday, to support Mr. Lynch against Mr. O'Shea, Mr. Parnell's nominee, in the Parliamentary contest in that city. Mr. Parnell went to Galway on Tuesday, and was received with disfavor. After a short conference, however, with Mr. Lynch he persuaded the latter to withdraw from the Galway contest.

Archbishop Croke has written to the London *Statist* approving the scheme of Robert Giffen to buy out the Irish landlords.

The "starving mechanics" of London met around the Nelson Monument in Trafalgar Square on Monday. About 10,000 men were present, the Socialist element predominating. Many policemen were present. Mr. Burns, the Socialist, was a conspicuous member of the crowd. He ascended the pedestal of the Nelson monument to deliver a harangue, but was forcibly removed by the police. The mob soon brushed the officers away, and Burns again ascended the pedestal and waved a red flag. A fiercely worded resolution was read, denouncing the existing order of things, and summoning Parliament to immediately relieve the distress of British workmen. The police again charged the mob and pulled the speakers from the monument. The great and increasing crowd then spread through the adjacent streets, stoning club-houses and dwellings, sacking saloons, and smashing windows. Several thousand pounds' worth of jewelry, clothing, etc., were looted. The mob dispersed during the evening of its own accord, the police, however, breaking up some of its remnants. The meeting was really started by fair-traders, but Socialists got control. A number of arrests have been made.

An extraordinary fog Thursday morning put an end for a time to the excitement caused by the riot. Later in the day the fog cleared and the mob began to assemble in Trafalgar Square. By 3 o'clock in the afternoon 10,000 ruffians had assembled. The police charged them twice without effect. Finally, at 4:30 P. M., the authorities becoming alarmed, enormously increased the police force. A vigorous charge was made and the mob driven into the side streets. Many of the rioters were arrested.

The principal landlords in Wales have combined to resist the demand of the Farmers' League for a reduction of 25 per cent. in farm rents.

At the annual meeting of the shareholders of the Anglo-American Cable Company in London on Friday it was reported that the receipts for 1885 had been reduced £93,926 as compared with those of 1884. This was explained by the cutting of rates and the competition of the Mackay-Bennett Company.

The French Chamber of Deputies on Thursday agreed that the crown jewels should be sold to provide a fund for aged workmen. The debate on the subject was attended with great excitement. Comte de Lanjuinais predicted that the Republic would be speedily overthrown. His prediction was received with a chorus of howls. It is estimated that the jewels that are to be sold will produce $40,000,000. Some that are of historic interest will go to the Louvre collection. The gems of artistic and educational interest, valued at 13,000,000 francs, will be handed to the Museum and School of Mines. The Radicals gave notice of a motion to expel princes of former reigning families.

Louise Michel will not go to Russia, but will start an Anarchist paper in Paris called *Terre et Liberté*.

Count St.-Vallier, a French diplomat and statesman, is dead at the age of fifty-three. He was sent to Stuttgart in 1868 as Minister Plenipotentiary. During the Franco-German war he was Commissioner-General of the army of occupation. In 1876 he was made a Senator, and subsequently was appointed Minister to Berlin, where he was favorably received.

The agreement between France and Germany regarding their respective possessions on the west coast of Africa and in the South Sea, has been submitted to the German Reichstag. The agreement contains an amicable understanding with respect to the rival claims of the two Powers to the territory lying on Biafra Bay; Germany surrendering her assumed sovereignty and protectorate over all that part of the country lying south of the river Campo, north latitude 3°, and France abandoning all claim to any territory north of that river.

Prince Bismarck has ordered the hauling down of the German flag on the islands of the Caroline group occupied by the Germans previous to the decision of the Pope in regard to the ownership of the islands.

It is authoritatively stated that Greece will immediately disarm, provided Turkey cedes Epirus in accordance with the Berlin treaty.

Prince Alessandro Torlonia died in Italy on Sunday, at the age of eighty-six. He was one of the greatest landowners in Italy. His princely title he received from Victor Emanuel in acknowledgment of his service to the State in draining Lake Fucino, on the border of the Neapolitan province. Many of the most important excavations and discoveries of art treasures were made by him, and his collection of antiquities ranks second only to that in the Vatican.

The notorious Russian Nihilist, Sergius Ivanoff, has been captured.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

MR. GARLAND'S POSITION.

THE *Evening Post* prints in a Washington despatch what is undoubtedly the latest version furnished by Mr. Garland or his friends of the origin and nature of his relations to the now attacking party, the Pan-Electric Company. Mr. Garland now says that "he does not divest himself of his interest in the Pan-Electric Co., because, in the present temper of his assailants, most of whom are misled by one-sided statements and imperfect knowledge, such action on his part would be construed as an acknowledgment that he had done wrong." But this seems to us to show that Mr. Garland takes a mistaken view of the whole matter. The position of the Attorney-General is a quasi-judicial one—that is, he is frequently called on to perform functions, such as authorizing or bringing suits on the application of private parties, and giving opinions regulating the action of other officers of the Government, which are judicial in their nature, and which may, as in this telephone case, exercise a great influence on the value of property. Now, the world has agreed, almost ever since justice began to be administered, that it is not enough that a judge should be pure; that it is also necessary that nobody, not even the prejudiced and the ignorant, should have any reason to doubt his purity. There are hundreds of men on the bench who could with perfect fairness try a case in which they had a large personal interest, but it is nevertheless a well-settled rule of judicial decorum, as well as of judicial policy, that a judge is disqualified for trying a case by any interest, however small. If a judge is called upon to try a suit against a corporation in which he is a stockholder, he does not say that he knows he can try it fairly and does not care what captious or ill-natured persons may think. He either refuses to try it or sells his stock, and he does this for the express purpose of preventing captious or ill-natured people from doubting the integrity of the courts. The courts sit, and attorney-generals act, not for the benefit of the clear-headed, and candid, and impartial alone, but for the benefit of the ignorant, and prejudiced, and easily deluded. These latter form a large portion of every community, and they have a right to feel satisfied that when they go to the law officers of the Government for justice they get the genuine article. When John Quincy Adams sold all his stocks on entering public life, it was not because he was afraid the possession of the stocks might lead him from the paths of virtue, but because he did not wish anybody who trusted him to suspect, even, that his course on any particular question was affected by his private interest.

What makes Mr. Garland's position all the more delicate is that there is something decidedly queer about this Pan-Electric stock. The Company was formed, he told the President in his letter of October 8, 1885, about three years ago, and he, while in the Senate, was presented with some of the stock and made its attorney. Soon after he gave the Company an opinion that the Rogers patent which it was to work, did not in any way infringe the Bell patent. The Company appears, however, to have had neither capital nor credit, and during the following three years did nothing but distribute or try to distribute large blocks of its apparently worthless stock among members of Congress. Last March the new Administration came into power, and the attorney for the Company became Attorney-General of the United States. Almost immediately thereafter—that is, as he says, "some time last summer"—the Company applied to him to get the United States to institute and bear the expense of a suit to attack the Bell patent, which he had advised the Company its own patent did not infringe at all.

He refused, but the Solicitor-General—the Attorney-General's "assistant" under the statute—did it for him in his absence. The President recommended that the application should be referred to the Interior Department, which contains two of the active promoters of the Company and distributers of the stock, in the persons of General Joseph E. Johnston, the Railroad Commissioner, and J. D. C. Atkins, the Indian Commissioner. The Interior Department thereupon authorized a suit assailing the Bell patent on the application of the Pan-Electric Company, which has suddenly discovered, since the new Administration came into power, not that the Rogers patent infringes the Bell, but that the Bell infringes the Rogers. This suit the Attorney-General's Office will have to carry on, and the cost of it will come out of the United States Treasury.

Now, there is not one fact in the foregoing brief narrative which convicts anybody of corruption or dishonesty, but there is hardly one which does not call for some sort of explanation from such officers of the United States as it concerns. As regards Mr. Garland, we think the situation is one which he cannot explain satisfactorily without corresponding action—and that action should consist either in divesting himself totally of his interest in a stock which he got for nothing, and the value of which may be largely increased by the action of the Government of which he forms a part, or surrendering the position he holds as legal adviser of the Government. Neither of these courses would be an acknowledgment that he had done wrong. The first and the easiest would be simply an acknowledgment that he had come into possession of a piece of property which exposed him to suspicions that interfered with his usefulness as a public officer. It is not the business of the Administration to vindicate him or any other man. The business of the Administration is to keep itself above suspicion, no matter what the cost may be to individuals. The "fire rule," which President Grant was so fond of, and which prevented him from getting rid of an officer as long as he "was under fire," *i. e.*, as long as people were accusing him of something, was a very good rule for indiscreet or dishonest officers, but it ruined the Administration.

VIRGINIA COUPON BONDS.

THE decisions of the Supreme Court delivered on the first day of this month are entirely in accordance with the construction which the *Nation*, nearly three years ago, put upon the first decisions relating to the same subject-matter. The *Nation*, in its issue of November 1, 1883, took the ground that the decision of Antoni v. Greenhow, over which the dishonest element in Virginia rejoiced as sustaining in every substantial particular the repudiation of the so-called Riddleberger laws, did in fact sustain them only to a limited extent. It was pointed out that although the Supreme Court refused to force the State of Virginia to give receipts for coupons tendered in payment of taxes, it none the less insisted upon the inviolability of the contract which made these coupons legal tender for such payment; that the meaning of this apparently paradoxical opinion of the court was clearly shown in a long course of past decisions, to the effect that while the court would not assist suitors in aggressive action against a State which had transcended its powers, neither would it permit a State in transcendence of its powers to commit aggressive actions against individuals; and that the court was driven to this position from the necessity of declaring that, while the Eleventh Amendment to the Constitution prohibiting suit against a State was valid, so was that provision in the main body of the Constitution prohibiting any State from passing a law in abrogation of contracts.

Such was taken to be the necessary, logical consequence of the opposing provisions of the Constitution, as indicated by the decisions thereon rendered; and the *Nation* felt safe to predict that the present court would advance the logic of its predecessors to its legitimate conclusion when a case directly called for it—as Antoni v. Greenhow did not—because it thought the attitude of the present majority of the court toward constitutional government was very clearly shown in the Arlington case. It was there decided that even the sovereign power of the United States exercised in confiscation of the estates of the leader of the forces of a great rebellion, at the very time of the rebellion, must proceed under the Constitution, and, therefore, according to due process of law. And it seemed sure ground to take, that if the United States could not exercise sovereign powers at such a time and on such an occasion, then with national sovereignty must fall the old and vicious nullification doctrine of State sovereignty; or else it must be declared that sovereignty does not exist in the United States, but that constitutional government is *per se* made up of many departments, each of limited powers.

The Virginia taxpayer who holds these coupons is now guaranteed the following rights, strictly confining the decisions to the facts actually involved in them: He may make tender of coupons in payment of his taxes, whether they be ordinary taxes or license fees, and after that his taxes are held as paid; and if any officer of Virginia seeks to make collection by seizure of his property he may be sued as a trespasser, or suit may be brought to recover the property; and if the officer plead the State law under which he acted, he will plead void laws, which can afford him no protection. As corollary to these general rights, whenever the seizure of property, such as the rolling stock of a railroad, is liable to do irreparable injury to the taxpayer, the State officer may be enjoined. These rights, on the other hand, belong to a taxpayer alone, and even he cannot bring direct suit against a tax-collector for simply refusing his coupons without other aggres-

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

sive act; nor suit which will force the collector to give a receipt except so far as a rather inadequate law of Virginia passed January 14, 1882, allows him to do so; for it appears that this act, as being an equivalent for a State law in existence when the coupons were issued, is considered part of the contract and in substance irrepealable.

Four justices, including the Chief Justice, dissent. They base their dissent upon the broad ground that the Eleventh Amendment, because it is an amendment, or is subsequent to the original Constitution, sweeps away all opposing clauses and renders an individual powerless to hold a State to its contract. Undoubtedly their reasoning is less subtle than the reasoning of the majority of the court. It is the cutting of a hard knot, because its windings and twistings, though possible to unravel, tire the patience. The reasoning would commend itself to the unlearned in law as much as they would deprecate its results, and the more unlearned the more it commends itself to them.

The importance of these new decisions can hardly be overrated. If they are accepted without resistance, they will mark the first victory of the Supreme Court over a really recalcitrant and angry State. The supremacy of the national power as represented by the Executive was of course triumphant in the civil war, and was before triumphant in lesser struggles, as in the Whiskey Rebellion and in Jackson's famous victory, through threats of force, over South Carolina; but until the present time the United States has never been victorious in its judiciary department over a State determined to defy it. Chisholm, it is true, in 1792 obtained a decree that judgment by default should go against Georgia if she did not appear before a certain day; but before that day the indignant and frightened State succeeded in pushing through Congress the Eleventh Amendment, under which Virginia has just sought shelter through devious and intricate legal paths. There have been many other cases before the Supreme Court in which acts of State Legislatures have been declared unconstitutional and void, but never when the State has used all its civil power, its intellect and obstinacy, backed finally by a united public opinion, to frustrate the constitutional demands of hated creditors. These decisions are, then, the first absolutely peaceable triumph of the Constitution and its honest principles over the narrowness, bitterness, and often dishonesty of local popular will, and as such they form an epoch in constitutional history. It is a triumph of the regular power of the national Government over the irregular power of the State, just as the Arlington case was a triumph over irregular power of the national Government.

CONNECTICUT'S WARNING AGAINST THE FEDERAL EDUCATION SCHEME.

THE question of Federal aid to education in the States, with an especial view to overcoming illiteracy at the South, is so important that it merits thorough discussion. The letters that we have received, and continue to receive, since our recent article, and the comments of other journals upon the views then expressed, justify a recurrence to the subject. The great difficulty hitherto has been that the public has not given much thought to the vital issues involved, most people hastily yielding acquiescence to the scheme upon hearing the plausible surface arguments in its favor. Signs of a disposition to get at the fundamental principles underlying it are therefore welcome.

As we previously remarked, the North feels generously toward the South, and is therefore favorably disposed toward any measure that promises to dispel the cloud of ignorance which has overspread that part of the country. Moreover, many Northern people feel as though the nation was under an obligation to assume a portion of this burden. The *Christian Union* speaks for this class when it says:

"An appropriation for education in the Southern States is not a gift of charity; it is the payment of a debt due by justice. The nation shares in the responsibility for slavery. It is wholly responsible for emancipation and enfranchisement. If the South had enfranchised the blacks, we might leave the South to educate them; but in putting the ballot into one hand we obliged ourselves to put the school-book into the other."

It is also urged that the Federal Government virtually rendered educational assistance to the new States in the West by setting apart school lands for them, and that the Southern States, with the ignorance thrust upon them by emancipation, now stand in far more urgent need of assistance from the nation.

All the pleas for Federal aid proceed upon the assumption that such aid will be a good thing for the South. It is this assumption which we combat. We maintain that the worst thing which could befall the cause of education in the South would be a series of liberal appropriations from the national Treasury for a series of years. We mean, of course, the worst thing in the long run, for no judgment upon such a matter is of any value which is not based upon a long look ahead. We are ready to admit that more Southern voters might be able to read ten years hence if $100,000,000 should be appropriated by Congress for use chiefly in Southern schools than if the States were left to their own resources; but we insist that this temporary gain in intelligence would be purchased at the cost of a permanent loss in character vastly more important—the loss of self-reliance and self-respect.

One fact counts for more than a volume of theorizing, and it is therefore most fortunate that the demoralizing influence of outside school funds can be conclusively demonstrated from the experience of one of the oldest States in the Union. When Connecticut sold her Western Reserve lands, the proceeds were devoted to a school fund, in the expectation that this assistance would serve materially to elevate the standard of public education. The fund proved very productive, the income during the early part of this century varying from $70,000 to $100,000 a year, which was a large sum of money for a small State in those days, when the cost of maintaining schools was so much less than now. Before they had this outside income the people of Connecticut supported their schools entirely by taxation, just as the people of the South are doing now. What was the effect of receiving this assistance? The answer shall be furnished by Mr. C. D. Hine, Secretary of the State Board of Education, a recognized authority in the matters of which he speaks:

"The school fund derived from the sale of Western lands yielded an income last year of $120,855, which amounts to 80 cents for each person of the school age. The average expense of educating each of these persons throughout the State is $10 31, so that the fund now furnishes about 8 per cent. of the total cost. In those towns and cities where the people insist upon good schools no reliance is placed upon these permanent funds. Indeed, the history of our State shows conclusively that at the time when the fund was most productive, yielding $1 40 or $1 50 for each person of the school age, and when towns depended upon it, as they generally did, for the support of their schools, the schools themselves were poor and short. In fact, this was the darkest period of our educational experience. A very striking deterioration took place as soon as the fund became productive and the income began to be distributed. Before that period schools had been maintained at least six months, and at most nearly the whole year, according to the size of the district. After, and not long after, this new source of income was opened, the usual length of schools was reduced to only three months, or just the time that this fund would maintain the schools. The sums which came as gratuities relieved the people of responsibility and deadened their interest, until the schools were continued only so long as the charity lasted. Happily, the danger from this direction is passed and cannot return. The fund has probably reached its greatest productiveness, and the per capita will constantly decrease. The public schools must draw their sustenance from the people who are directly or indirectly benefited by them."

The Blair Bill simply proposes to do for the whole South what the Western Reserve fund did for Connecticut. Human nature is much the same everywhere, and if one were to try differentiating it, he certainly would not find the Southern character less likely to be demoralized by subsidies than the Northern. The men who had this fund set apart for the benefit of Connecticut's schools undoubtedly thought that they were doing the State a great service; but it has proved a curse, and the people are now congratulated that "the danger from this direction is passed," because the growth of population has forced them to tax themselves in order to educate their children. The *Christian Union* and the people who share its opinion that Federal appropriations for Southern education would be simply "the payment of a debt due by justice," are honest in their desire to benefit the South; but if they could accomplish their design, they would have proved its worst enemies.

The truth is that the South can educate herself, and is already beginning to do so. It will be a hard job, but her people, black and white, will be more manly, more self-reliant—more intelligent, in the long run—if they are left to work out their own salvation. The most hopeful sign for the South's future is that clear-headed Southern men are protesting against the efforts of well-meaning but short-sighted Northerners to give the South school money out of the Federal Treasury, which these Southern men see that she ought to raise and can raise herself.

GEORGE BORROW IN SPAIN.

SINCE reading the interesting papers on Borrow to which his death, in 1881, gave rise, I have been no little surprised to observe the resumption of the subject in the January number of *Macmillan's Magazine*, and a short Life in the fifth volume of the new 'Dictionary of National Biography.'* I interpret this as an instinctive clinging on the part of the public to the manly and independent author who has left such deep

* For the Review articles, see *Littell's Living Age*, Nos. 1945-47-54 for 1881, and No. 2171 for 1886.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

impressions on his time, and who will, I venture to prophesy, long continue to stir the hearts of his readers as for thirty years he has stirred my own.

This conviction prompts me to record some of my observations during a long residence in the Peninsula, in which the traces of the campaigns of 1835–40 often drew my attention to the man and his work. The period of Borrow's activity in Spain was during the reign of the Queen Regent, Doña Christina, and not of Isabella II., as some of the articles have stated, for Isabella was not declared to be Queen till 1844, at the age of thirteen. Borrow was in St. Petersburg in the summer of 1835, and the preface to his 'Targum,' published there in that year, is dated June 1. He left about the 10th of October, and reached Lisbon November 11, commissioned by the British and Foreign Bible Society to make an entrance for the Scriptures into Spain. The political situation was one of high excitation. The Liberals had demanded a constitutional government, but obtained only the sedative called the Royal Statute of 1834, which, instead of allaying, only aroused the popular passions till the revolution of "The Grange" (La Granja), in August, 1836, put the Progresistas in power. The Moderados, to whom the Queen Mother intrusted the fortunes of her child, being defeated, a tilt was kept up between the two great parties, which lasted till the temporary triumph of the advanced party culminated in the expulsion of Christina from Spain in 1840, after Borrow's work was done.

His appearance, then, on the scene in 1835 was at a most critical and difficult juncture. The partisans of Carlism filled the land with all the horrors of civil war, and the attention of the Madrid-Government was distracted from its legitimate cares by the sudden raids of Gomez, Cabrera, and other Carlist chieftains, threatening at times the very capital. Only those who know Old Spain can comprehend why Borrow, under these circumstances, began his mission *ex infimo*, with the lower orders. What would one of your sleek, solemn, black-gloved weaklings have wrought among the traditional *majos*, *manólos*, and *chulos*—"b'hoys" of the ring—the first to conciliate because they were and are the skirmishers of a foe that lurks in high places? What would kind words and Christian smiles have achieved among such men as you find crowded between the Lavapiés and the Calle de Toledo? We met them first in 1867, tamed by thirty years of modern civilization, with its whiz and whirr of steam and electricity. What must they have been in '37, with their red sashes bristling with knives, their cloaks concealing an arsenal of sinister tools, over the mufflers of which peeped coal-black eyes, and in whose breast pity never lodged!

Borrow's mission lay through the midst of these. The old words and the ancient strategy that had put him at the head of gypsydom in England were appealed to for personal insulation in the maze of hidden dangers in the Peninsula. With such "pals" he could defy the Captains-General, the night-prowling *alguaciles*, and even the lowest factotums of unscrupulous power. He set himself at work and became the *Inglesito*, "Master of the Seven Jargons," the friend of Montés, Sevilla, Poquito Pan, and all the guild of bull-baiting heroes once famous in the plazas of Madrid and Seville.

After long searching I at last found a copy of the Gypsy Gospel—'El Embéo e Majaró Lúcas'—which Borrow translated in 1836 at Badajóz, "opré a mixa de Laloró" (on the frontier of Portugal), and printed at Madrid in 1837: a remarkable work, and one which, with the 'Gypsies of Spain,' whose vocabulary and facts were soon reproduced in Spanish, has had no small influence on the popular language and even on the literature. The native vocabularies of Trujillo, Campuzano, Mayo, and others, which appeared since 1844, are simply Borrow's 'Gypsy Word-Book of 1841, concealed by false *caló* additions taken from the *Slang* Dictionary of Hidalgo. The celebrated dramatic author, Bretón de los Herréros, has several prose plays interlarded with Borrow's Gypsy words, a fact that is especially patent in the school editions by Germans, who know not what explanation to give them. See Booch-Arkossy's edition of "La Independencia" for ludicrous examples. The vulgar speech of the lowly at Madrid to-day cannot be understood without a knowledge of Mayo's (that is, Borrow's) vocabulary. At every turn you hear *gachó* for "cove"; *chavó* for "chummy"; *chachipé*, "that's so"; *parné*, money; *diquelár*, to see; *camelár*, to love, like, to flatter; *penár*, to say, to speak, etc., etc. Once it was the fashion in Spain to learn the Germania or cant language; Cervántes wrote a novel in it, and Quevedo several poems. Now Gypsy has replaced it, and an *Englishman* introduced the fancy! Borrow probably never knew it, but I can prove the statement by a volume of extracts, none of which will antedate 1842.

Borrow in his 'Bible' and 'Gypsies' has suffered at the public bar all those insinuations which a writer must undergo who thoroughly knows the country he describes. Most men who have attacked the subject have been prudent enough to limit their observations to what their eyes could fathom, carefully abstaining from a knowledge of the language whereby they might get at enough truth to jostle the prejudices of their readers, who want only to hear what they have been wont to believe. No scrupulous author likes to be included in a charge of exaggeration, and that apprehension often tones down his expressions till they reach untruth by the opposite extreme. The fact is, Borrow had an intimate knowledge of the Spanish character and language, and he gives us the most exact delineation of the plain Castilian to be found in literature. One of the best tests of such works is to translate portions of them to the natives of the district described. I have frequently done this before a group of the class he immortalizes, and never failed to elicit the most unequivocal marks of approval. One said, gravely: *El gachó e' mu' ducho* (the "cove" is an expert); another recognized the book to be profoundly Spanish—*muy español*—a decision which provoked unanimous assent, and from which there was no appeal. A third would condense his convictions into a most expressive exclamation, not intended for publication, but in the mind of all an apposite compliment.

The 'Bible' and 'Gypsies' are two extraordinary publications, worthy the adjectives "valuable and extremely interesting" which Mr. Longfellow applies to them. I do not remember to have discovered a positive error in them, and I have travelled with them all over the land, as in the sixteenth century Diego de Mendoza did with his 'Celestina' and 'Amadís de Gáula.' As to his exactness I will cite one example. In the London *Times* of 1836 are the political letters from Spain, perhaps by that correspondent to whom Borrow refers, on the Revolution of La Granja. The latter's statement of the affair seems exaggerated, but it is strictly true. The correspondent denies that General Quesada was mutilated that day by the infuriated mob. Borrow says he was, and that the Madrid roughs drank coffee from a monster bowl into which had been thrown the hands and fingers of the late Captain-General of the Province. Years after, the Spanish historian, Xavier de Búrgos, in his 'Annals of the Reign of Isabella the Second,' confirms Borrow in these words: "The masses assassinated and mutilated him (Quesada), and returned to the capital bringing in triumph the bloody members of their victim, which were received in the Café Nuevo with the howlings of savage exultation proper to cannibals in their execrable orgies" (vol. iii, p. 307). Búrgos was one of the cabinet ministers in those days, and was in Madrid at the time of the Revolution. In many other respects Borrow's account is better and more exact than the ones now held as historical; for I have often heard the details from those who were with Queen Christina at the Grange that memorable day, when she was compelled to yield to the Sergeant García and sign the promulgation of the Constitution of Cadiz (1812).

Everywhere that I met Gitanos, they all knew "the Englishman," and the words he left in his vocabulary were everywhere current coin. I visited them in the Triana and the Macaréna, famous suburbs of Seville, and in the Albaïcín of Granada on the slope where their *cuevas*, dug out of the solid earth, form the queerest of homes under the towers of the Alhambra. In Granada itself I once received a visit from the *conde*, or Gypsy chief, a tall, perfectly-formed man of middle age, who gave me his address written on a card in a fair, round hand: Señor António, Maéstro Herréro en el Salón—Mr. Anthony, Master Blacksmith on the Promenade (of the Genil)—a pure Jasper Petulengro of Spain.

Besides these Egyptian gentry, I met Borrow's blind girl of Manzanáres. His "girl" of nineteen was now a woman of fifty-five, I should judge; though age-telling is one of the mysteries of that country. I was returning from Portugal in 1876, and while the train stopped at this station which meets the through-line from Madrid to Cadiz, I heard a strong, but cheerful, pleasant voice cry out in the night: "Bon soir, messieurs, quelque chose pour la pauvre aveugle de Mançanarès." I saw the point at once and rushed out of the train to see her. She was decently dressed in the ordinary *percalina* of the country; her hair was now gray, but her form proud and erect, proper to the grave bearing of the peasant class to which she by birth belonged. She spoke to me in Spanish, Latin, and French, the latter more than passable. She remembered the *Inglés rúbio* (the blonde Englishman), she said, and recognized that to him she owed much of her celebrity, and not a few of the *pesetas* she received. No one stopped at the station without remembering the *pobre ciega*—the poor blind woman, who speaks the tongue of the stranger.

As for his New Testament of 1837, Borrow has been stoutly attacked by an English writer whose twaddle was copied and endorsed on this side of the water, for forcing on the Spaniards the *Lutheran Bible* "when they had one as good of their own." I wonder if the grumbler ever saw the Spanish Lutheran Bible or the native one either. Now the best of the joke is that Borrow printed and circulated in the Peninsula just that *Catholic* version those haters of Bibles said he ought to have introduced. Spain had no Bible, Catholic or Protestant, till 1791-3, and then it came out in ten *folio* volumes, costing even now $50 a set. Borrow simply reduced the New Testament of that Scio-Bible to one small volume, by leaving out the notes, commentary, and pictures; and Andrés Borrégo, the brave Liberal, still living at Madrid, printed it in the office of his journal, *El Español*.

What influence did Borrow's distribution of the New Testament exert on Spain from 1837? The influence that the wind has at harvest on a Spanish threshing-floor. The farmer drives his mules over the grain, then casts up the straw into the air, while the breeze carries away the chaff, leaving the pure wheat on the floor. Many a thoughtful man read the Englishman's book, gave

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

up the chaff of life, and fed for ever after on the golden grain. Who knows how many? We have met them in Galicia, at San Sebastian, at Madrid, at Valencia, at Seville, at Málaga. The well-known scholars, Luis de Usóz y Rio, Fermin Caballero, Brunet of Guipúzcoa, Andrés Borrégo; the printers, José Martin Alegría, José Cruzado (through Usóz), and many others, all dead save three, are the fruit of George Borrow's Bible in Spain. Of those whose names we cannot mention, two have surviving families, living on Government pensions, and to cite them by name would be, if not to deprive them of their sole support, at least to subject them to certain social ostracism. I met the venerable heads of these lovely families in 1872, and they told me that for thirty-five years they had held service at home, ignorant of collect, prayer, or form of worship. I possess the printed service they contrived to draw up, containing the prayers they daily read and extracts from the sacred book. When liberty of worship came in 1869 they took no overt part, well knowing that freedom in Spain was but nominal, or for the irresponsible poor. Usóz y Rio, the noble Castilian and Castilian nobleman, lived a retired life from 1842 to his death in 1865, secretly editing the twenty volumes of the ancient Spanish Reformers, printed in the cellar of Alegría's house in the suburbs of Madrid, during the dark days of Isabella's reign. Fermin Cabal'ero, once a minister of the crown, devoted himself to books and learning, and was the author of the 'Conquenses Ilustres,' or Illustrious Men of Cuenca, in four volumes, a set of which he gave me with his trembling autograph a month before he died. I followed his body to the grave one summer's day in 1876.

Why did not these distinguished gentlemen stand forth when liberty of conscience was secured by the Constitution of 1869? Because liberty of conscience in Spain still means ruin to those who embrace it, unless they be too poor to have social bonds or are too lowly to attract official persecution.

W. I. KNAPP.

FALL OF THE SALISBURY MINISTRY.

LONDON, January 30, 1886.

UP to the very morning of Thursday, January 19, when the Queen opened Parliament, there were those who hoped that Lord Salisbury's Ministry would be kept in office by dissensions in the Liberal party, and exhorted that Ministry to show themselves valiant, and win by boldness and patriotism the support of the Moderate Liberals. But, before the echoes of the Queen's speech had died from the ears of the crowd that had watched the brilliant scene in the House of Lords, men began to feel how vain were such hopes, how wasted such exhortations. The two parties confronted one another with their old hostility, and in the speech from the throne the Ministry had confessed the difficulty of its position, and its hesitation as to the policy to be pursued in Ireland. Those who counted on a coalition of moderate men on both sides perceived how potent an obstacle to any such arrangement was the presence of Mr. Gladstone, overtopping all his allies and opponents. And when the practical question arose, what sort of coercion bill ought to be presented for Ireland, by what evidence of the state of the country it must be supported, how it was to be passed against the resistance of the Irish members, the problem that lay before a Ministry in a minority looked far more formidable than the readers of newspapers had been led to believe. Curiosity and expectation had risen to a higher point than any one remembers; not only because the situation was critical, but because the tone and tendencies of the new Parliament, more than half of whose members did not sit in the last Parliament, were an unknown but decisive factor.

The interest of the first night's debate on the address in reply to the Queen's speech centred in Mr. Gladstone's discourse, which, according to custom, followed immediately on the morning of the address. Would he admit or repudiate the views about home rule ascribed to him? Would he attack the Ministry, or promise them a truce? Would he indicate a policy of his own? He had not spoken five minutes before one thing was certain, that his oratorical power had suffered no decline. Seldom has he been more delicately wary and skilful. He praised Lord Salisbury's policy in the Bulgarian troubles. He committed himself to no positive line of policy, either as respects home rule or coercive measures, insisting that the responsibility of making proposals lay with the Ministry, and he advised the new members to reserve their judgment on the necessary course till such proposals were laid before them. He showed that as respects home rule he had not gone an inch beyond the declaration contained in his address to the electors of Midlothian last September; that no Tory speakers had attacked or censured this declaration; that the expressions used by Lord Salisbury during the campaign went quite as far toward home rule as his own. With a sarcasm so fine that it might scarcely have been perceived but for the way in which the cheers of his supporters emphasized its point, he compared the language of the Tory leaders during the election, when they were still anxious to win the Irish vote in English constituencies, with that which they now held. And in two passages of solemn eloquence, which thrilled his auditors the more by their contrast with the easy and quiet tone of the rest of his speech, he appealed to the House of Commons to give a fair and large-minded consideration to any scheme which the Nationalist members or any other members could propose for ameliorating the state of Ireland and its relations with Great Britain.

The effect of this speech on the House, and particularly on the new Liberal members, was enormous. They had come up anxious and doubting, some opposed, some fearing their constituents would be opposed to anything savoring of home rule. They were now swept away by admiration for the prowess of their leader, and seemed to see the whole landscape with different eyes. A new feeling ran through the party, and made it feel itself again compact and hopeful. Mr. Parnell followed with words carefully chosen to maintain the impression Mr. Gladstone had created. He is always calm and collected; he was now also conciliatory, deprecating excitement, minimizing difficulties, expressing no impatience. The Tory leaders were guarded; they echoed energetically the declaration in the Queen's speech against any tampering with the Act of Union, but they did not commit themselves to measures of coercion, announcing in the debate of Friday that they were sending to Ireland as Chief Secretary one of their most prominent ministers to report on the state of the country with a view to legislation. That second night's debate was marked by a long and striking speech from Mr. Sexton, restating the Parnellite position, and a warm appeal by Mr. Elliott, an Anti-Home-Rule Liberal, to the Liberal leaders—particularly to Lord Hartington and Mr. Chamberlain—to declare themselves on the Irish question. The same line had been taken by Mr. Albert Grey on Thursday, and these speeches were significant as manifestations of the spirit of revolt in one wing of the Liberal party against the home-rule ideas attributed to Mr. Gladstone. If this so-called "Whig" wing, which has spoken out strongly through the Dukes of Bedford and Westminster, not to mention less important peers, were really to act together against Mr. Gladstone, and to find a powerful leader in Lord Hartington or Mr. Goschen, it would become a formidable factor in the situation. It might command considerable voting power in the House of Commons, and exercise a still greater influence in the country. However, Mr. Grey and Mr. Elliott were left alone in their protests, and the opinion gained ground on Friday and Saturday that the great bulk of the party would, for the present at least, cling to Mr. Gladstone.

These also were days of feverish eagerness and excitement. Among the Tories the question was, "What shall we do about Ireland?" The idea of moving toward home rule had been dropped, if it ever seriously existed, a month before. But was a coercion bill needed? Did the state of Ireland prove the necessity? Was it prudent to break finally with the Nationalists by introducing it? Might it not be better to go out of office at once, leaving the Liberals to face the question, and reserving the right of renewing, in case the latter proposed a coercion bill, the alliance of Tories and Parnellites? On the other hand, there was English opinion to consider, still irritated by the reports of boycotting and the refusal of rent. Since the Salisbury Ministry must soon die, ought it not to die with dignity, championing the cause of order, introducing its coercion bill, and throwing on Mr. Gladstone the odium of resisting such a measure side by side with the Parnellite "enemies of the Empire"? In the Tory party itself much disappointment was expressed at the hesitating timidity of the Cabinet, and their journals told them they were losing their hold on the country and sinking to the level of a Gladstone Ministry.

The perplexities of the Liberals were not less acute. It was now plain that they would turn out Lord Salisbury when and as they pleased, for the Parnellite phalanx was prepared to vote on their side. But was it prudent to turn out the Government? Why not give it more rope, force it to discredit itself still further with the country, leave it to struggle with the difficulties its Irish policy had created, let it show its weakness in Parliamentary debate, keep it in office till the time came for it to produce its Budget, and then kill it on some financial issue? Would not the Liberal party grow stronger and more united in opposition than if, in the formation of a new Cabinet, the differences of view among its leaders stood revealed? Would not opinion in the country come round to give a more favorable consideration to schemes of home rule if an interval were allowed it for reflection before a Liberal Ministry could be called on to produce a positive policy for Ireland? These were weighty arguments, and to them was added another which, though it appealed to members of the House of Commons only, appealed powerfully to them. The Tory Ministry had tabled a series of resolutions for the improvement of Parliamentary procedure. The need of some improvements, large and sweeping improvements, is undeniable, and had been strongly urged by Mr. Gladstone in his election address. Although there were parts of the Tory proposals on the subject which the House of Commons would have rejected, and though other changes were needed which the Ministry had not proposed, the fact that they had put forward these resolutions afforded an excellent opportunity, which might not soon recur, of settling the question and establishing new rules under which all future Governments would find it easier to despatch business.

While the minds of politicians hung in this state of doubt, it occurred to them that there were certain amendments put down to the address to the Crown on which it was possible for the Ministry to be defeated. The moving

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

of such amendments, unless for the purpose of taking a party vote of want of confidence, is a novel practice, which old Parliamentarians condemn. However, here these amendments stood, and if the practice was novel, so assuredly was such a situation as the present. On Sunday, the 24th, it began to be whispered that the Ministry might fall upon one of these amendments; and on Monday discussion was keen among the Liberals whether they ought to turn out the Government on this issue, among the Tories whether they ought to accept the opportunity of going out. The interest was heightened by an announcement which Lord Salisbury made on Monday evening, that within twenty-four, or at most forty-eight, hours he would declare his Irish policy. An incident in the House of Commons further increased the tension. The first amendment to the address was withdrawn. The second was a somewhat vague complaint that the Queen's speech held out no prospect of securing better conditions of tenure to farmers. So eager were the new Liberal members, especially those from the county divisions, to vote for this amendment that the Liberal whips were obliged to let it be known that they did not desire to carry it, and Liberal members went about trying to keep their fellows from voting against the Tory Government. Even with these exertions, the Government had a narrow escape, for the Parnellites went against them, and thus the amendment was defeated by no more than twenty-eight votes, some of which were given by Liberals. Such a result made every one realize how hard it would be to keep in power a Government which is in a minority of 170. It was like a cracked cup which cannot be handled without a risk of breaking it. If it escaped defeat to-day, it might meet defeat to-morrow. The position, in fact, was unmaintainable, and the only question that remained for each party was to choose the best occasion, the one for expelling their adversaries from power, the other for falling with dignity in a good cause.

The Tories made their choice first. On Tuesday afternoon they announced that next Thursday they would bring in a bill for suppressing the Irish National League and strengthening the criminal law in Ireland. This was a bold and hearty bid, albeit made somewhat late in the day, for the enthusiasm of English and Irish Tories and the support of moderate Liberals. It was an offer of battle on ground which they deemed favorable to themselves, and a challenge to the Opposition leaders to say what they also thought of Irish affairs. It evoked a prompt reply from the latter. The word was at once passed round that the Ministry were to be defeated on the amendment to the address which came on this same Tuesday evening. It was an amendment regretting that no pledge was given in the Queen's speech to bring in a bill facilitating the acquisition by laborers of allotments and small holdings. It had the advantage of conciliating the good will of the newly enfranchised rural voters, and of putting the Tory party in the unpleasant position of seeming to oppose what would be a benefit to them. But the chief reason for using it as the weapon wherewith to slay the Salisbury Ministry was that in this way the Liberals would escape the necessity of committing themselves either for or against coercion in Ireland, which they must have done had the Ministry brought in its bill on Thursday and asked, as they proposed then to do, that all the time of the House should be devoted to its consideration.

But though it was at once clear that the Ministry would be thrown out, because the Nationalists were known to be going to vote against them, there were still some Liberals who doubted the expediency of coming into power, and wished that the Tory Government had been forced to show its hand more distinctly, and therewith to show also its unfitness to grapple with the situation. These dissentients were, however, not the less resolved to vote with their party. It was on the action of another section that attention fixed itself—the moderate men, headed by Lord Hartington and Mr. Goschen, who were known to dislike both the allotments scheme suggested by the amendment, and the ulterior proclivities toward home rule with which Mr. Gladstone has been so persistently credited. They both spoke in the debate, Mr. Goschen warmly, Lord Hartington quietly, confining themselves to the immediate subject of the amendment, but virtually separating themselves from their party on the larger issue, which was deemed to lie behind the amendment. In voting for the Ministry and against Mr. Gladstone (who supported the amendment) they were followed by less than twenty members of the Liberal party, while a few other Liberals abstained from voting. The secession is, therefore, not numerically large, but it contains besides these two statesmen three or four other politicians of eminence, whose absence from a Liberal Government will be seriously felt.

At the moment of this writing the question is whether Mr. Gladstone, who has been sent for by the Queen, will succeed in forming a Ministry. The common belief is that he will, but that Lord Hartington will decline to join it. As this and much more will be known to you before these lines have crossed the Atlantic, I need not transmit to you the various rumors and speculations of the hour. But it is worth remarking that the most jubilant part of the majority which threw out the Government on the night of Tuesday, the 26th, was that which came from Ireland. The English and Scotch Liberals, except a few of the new members who enjoyed "tasting blood" in their first great party division, were sobered by the gravity of the occasion. Even those who were clear as to the policy of their vote saw many difficulties in store for the Liberal Cabinet they were calling into being, and wished it had been possible to leave responsibility for some time longer in their opponents' hands. Y.

A PATRICIAN OF VENICE.

PARIS, January 14, 1886.

M. YRIARTE has devoted himself chiefly to the study of Italian life and art. He has published excellent monographs on Venice, Florence, Rimini; he was (with M. Armand Baschet, the author of the 'Diplomatie vénitienne') one of the Frenchmen who first searched the precious archives of the Venetian Republic. With these State papers, he had the idea of reconstituting, so to speak, the figure of one of the great patricians of Venice. His work, entitled 'The Life of a Venetian Patrician in the Sixteenth Century, from the State Papers of the Frari,' had much success, and received a prize from the French Academy. As it had been for some time out of print, he has just issued a second edition, which has been adorned with many fine illustrations and reproductions of old prints and of the monuments of the time.

The patrician whom M. Yriarte chose as a type belonged to that important school of Venetian diplomats who have left us, in their despatches, the most important documents for the history of the sixteenth century. Marc Antonio Barbaro was one of the negotiators of the peace which followed the battle of Lepanto; he was the representative of the republic to the King of France, and the envoy of the Senate to Sixtus Quintus; he became Procurator, Reformator of the University of Padua, Proveditor of Friuli. He was a patron of art, the friend of Palladio, of Paul Veronese. He was somewhat of an artist himself, having been the pupil of Alessandro Vittoria. Born in 1517, he died in 1595, and for fifty-two years he was actively mixed up with the affairs of his country.

M. Yriarte tells us that he read the name of Barbaro for the first time on the door of a villa situated at Masera, in the province of Treviso—a villa which was built and adorned by Palladio, Veronese, and Vittoria. Having been struck by the elegance and the splendor of this habitation, he had the curiosity to consult the 'Genealogie dei nobili Veneti' of Capellari and Marco Barbaro. He found only twenty lines consecrated to his patrician. He made researches, read the inscriptions of the Rialto, of the Giant's Staircase, the sepulchral urns of San Francesco della Vigna. Then he turned his attention to the archives, and looked for all the traces of the personage whom he had chosen as a type of a great nobleman of Venice. The registers of the secretary, the deliberations of the Senate and of the Great Council, revealed to him the functions which he had occupied; in the Secret State Paper Office he found his credentials, his instructions, his despatches, his *Relazioni;* the series classed under the name "Constantinople" showed him in his diplomatic campaign after Lepanto, and he was able to follow him through all his diplomatic career. He found the citizen, the man, in his relations with the members of his family, in the *Archivio notarile.* He recognized Marc Antonio himself in a portrait which is in the gallery of the Belvedere in Vienna, signed by Paul Veronese—a portrait which had been offered as a present by the Ambassador of Constantinople to the Grand Vizier of the Sultan Selim. The patrician is represented in it with a despatch in his hand; in the background is the coast of Istria. The patrician figures also in an allegorical picture, in one of the rooms of the Ducal Palace, which represents the reception of Henri III. in Venice. Marc Antonio carries the *umbrellino* over the head of the King of France.

The personality of Barbaro partly disappears in the work of M. Yriarte before a higher aim. The patrician has furnished him a sort of *cadre* in which he has been able to introduce a complete study of the institutions of Venice. At the beginning of the sixteenth century the Venetian aristocracy was in its full ascendant, and had made a sort of monopoly of the Government of the republic. The aristocratic heredity dated from the thirteenth century, and had become the law of the country; it had found its expression in the 'Golden Book'; but it was only in 1506 that the Senate had confided to certain servants of the republic the care of inscribing the children born in the noble families, their marriages and their deaths. In the sixteenth century the *cittadini* were admitted to some offices; the rights of citizenship were extended to certain foreigners, *originarii*, under severe conditions; afterward, during the war on Candia, the Senate scandalized the old patricians by selling letters of nobility, and by giving for a hundred thousand ducats the right of inscription in the 'Golden Book' to the merchants. The republic went even further in these calamitous times, and was obliged to sell the office of Procurator of Saint-Mark.

Marc Antonio Barbaro did not see this decadence of the aristocracy. In his time the Government was purely aristocratic; it had all the defects and all the merits of the system of selection. The patrician belonged from childhood to Venice; he was in turn a lawyer, a diplomat, a soldier; he could not refuse his services in any capacity—he was obliged to do the work of Venice. The patricians formed a reserve of administrators and of political leaders. The secretaries, under the orders of the Grand Chancellor, formed a special order in the republic; they began their education at twelve and were able at eighteen to register the decrees, to copy the despatches. The

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

young patricians entered by right the Great Council at the age of twenty-five. All the Barbaros, from father to son, were educated at Padua. Marc Antonio, before going there, stayed for some time at Verona, which had then one of the best schools in Italy. At the age of twenty-three he became *Savio alli ordini*, a sort of attaché to the college or council of ministers, which was composed of twenty-six persons—the Doge, his six councillors, and various members divided in groups with different attributions. The Doge was a sort of constitutional king. He received almost regal honors, he presided over the Great Council, the Senate, the Council of Ten.

Yriarte's book is very discursive. When Barbaro marries the daughter of the Senator Giustiniani, he has a chapter on the condition of women at Venice in the sixteenth century. While the women in France at that time already played a part, in Venice they only appeared in the great festivities; in common times they were invisible. Read all the chronicles of the time, you never find the name of a Venetian woman. We cannot even say whether the Venetian ambassadors took their wives with them or not to France; these wives are never mentioned in the Court ceremonies. When Henri III. came to Venice, however, he was invited to a great banquet:

"'On Sunday,' says the author of the 'Feste e Trionfi fatti della Signoria di Venezia nella venuta di Henrico III.' (Roma, 1574), 'the Prince was asked to a feast given in the Hall of the Council. He arrived with the Doge, the Grand Prior, and the gentlemen of his suite. Two hundred patrician ladies of great beauty, dressed in white, and covered with pearls and diamonds, had ranged themselves along the walls of the room. . . . This enormous room, with its gilded roof, and all around the marvellous pictures of Giovanni Bellini, of Titian, of Tintoretto, and other great artists, presented a fine aspect. The King sat between the Doge, the dukes, the gentlemen, the barons, and the Signoria; all around was a crowd of elegant young women who seemed like so many nymphs and goddesses. Before sitting down, the King glanced at this magnificent *ensemble*, and, followed by a little court, advanced toward the ladies, who rose and curtsied to him. His Majesty gracefully returned this salute. Then, by degrees, two by two, group by group, at the sound of music, they began to dance, each coming in turn before the King.'"

This picture reminds one of the beautiful scenes painted by Veronese. But this was the official life; the domestic life was very different. The patrician lady was not always, as she appears in the costumes of Cesare Vecellio, or in the pictures in the Ducal Palace, clad in silks and heavy with golden ornaments, with hair dyed red, with long strings of pearls, adorned like an actress or a Madonna. A Frenchman of the seventeenth century, the Sieur de St.-Didier, wrote a curious book on Venice, 'La Ville et la République de Venise' (1680). He described in it the "gentildonnes," the patrician ladies, as leading a very retired life—so retired that "elle tient quelque chose de sauvage." If it was so in 1680, you may imagine how cloistral was feminine existence in the preceding century. The Venetians were always in contact with the East, and their wives lived like the women of the harem: they made no visits, remained always at home; the great ladies did not even go to church, as they had chapels in their palaces. The men were extremely jealous, and if they had any ground of suspicion, they sometimes kept their wives in their houses for years. The ladies were only seen at the great ceremonies, at the great marriages; they appeared then dressed with a magnificence which was often blamed by the "Proveditori alle pompe," officials who had been created in order to check luxury in the republic. These Proveditori were great enemies of the pearl, which always appears in the pictures of Veronese, but the Oriental pearl defeated all their efforts. The women of rank are not those who appear in the 'Ragionamenti' of Aretino, in the 'Novelle' of Bandello; they lived in the greatest mystery, and their charms were constantly hidden. They never went out except on enormous and noisy wooden pattens, with an immense white *fazzuolo* on their head and shoulders, when they were young. The Venice which was described by St.-Didier changed rapidly. In 1739 we have another description by the President Debrosses: nothing is concealed any more, and we become acquainted with the inner life, the pleasures, the vices of the aristocratic class.

The description of the Villa Barbaro near Treviso forms one of the most interesting chapters in Yriarte's book. He gives curious details concerning the frescoes of Veronese. This painter, who was a friend of Barbaro's, belongs to what might be called the pagan school of Venice, in contradistinction to the Christian school of the Bellinis. He begins the line of artists who were great decorators, and who ended with Tiepolo and Ricci. This pagan school, though it has left so many brilliant works, marks the slow decadence of Venice; but Veronese must be placed at the culminating point between the old times and the new. He represents Venice at the height of its power, glory, and wealth. He is, as Yriarte well says, a patrician of art; his facility, his creative power, his *maestria*, are truly wonderful. At the Villa Barbaro (a villa which is quite worth visiting) Veronese treated chiefly mythological subjects, and it is quite evident that mythology always had his preference; but on Olympus, as well as in religious subjects, he always remains a realist, and surrounds himself with episodical personages, all taken from Venice—soldiers, musicians, buffoons, children, beasts, fine ladies, and gentlemen. He covers Minerva with silks of the East, and dresses Mars like a *condottiere*. He was not a lettered man, like Rubens or like Titian; he appeared once before the Tribunal of the Inquisition, and the Inquisition found fault with the way in which he had painted the *Cenacolo* in the Convent of Saint John and Saint Paul. Veronese explained that he had painted what he had seen, and spoke exactly as a modern impressionist would do. He was obliged, however, to modify some parts of his picture.

Yriarte's work is a mine of facts and documents on the Venice of Veronese, and all the lovers of art will do well to peruse it, as well as the lovers of history.

Correspondence.

"ADVICE AND CONSENT."

To the Editor of The Nation:

Sir: The exact function of the United States Senate in the appointment of Federal officials has always been a much debated point. The Constitution provides that the President "shall nominate, and *by and with the advice and consent* of the Senate shall appoint." This, in practice, has meant that the President sends in a name and the Senate votes on it. But Senators have continually been claiming that the Constitution contemplated some manner of consultation with members of their body prior to a nomination; that the presence of the word "advice," when "consent" would otherwise have been sufficient, shows them to be in some sense a privy council, or, as they are pleased to call it, the "constitutional advisers" of the President. The proceedings of the Constitutional Convention and the writings of Madison and other subsequent expounders have been cited on one side or the other. I do not know that any one has gone back and traced to its beginning the phrase "advice and consent," in order to ascertain whether it had any accepted meaning as a phrase, apart from the meaning of its separate terms, at the time when the Convention adopted it. Curiosity has led me to collect some historical facts which seem to me to cast considerable light upon the interpretation. I shall endeavor to show you that the phrase "advice and consent" had had an accepted meaning, as a phrase, for centuries before 1787; that it meant simply "affirmative vote"; that the separate signification of "advice" had long been lost sight of; and lastly, by a review of what is known of the Convention of that year, that we have no reason to believe any new use of the phrase to have been then in mind.

The history of the phrase "advice and consent" is nothing but the history of the gradual evolution of the English Parliament from the Anglo-Saxon Witenagemot, or Assembly of the wise men of the kingdom, and the Norman Great Council of the realm. Its ancestry is traced in the oldest document preserved by Kemble, wherein Aethilberht, King of Kent, in the year 604, grants a charter of lands "with the advice of Lawrence the Bishop and of all my principal men." Even in the oldest times the theory of English government, enforced only against the weaker rulers, but formally respected by the stronger, required the consent as well as the advice of the subject; and already, in 759, we find King Sigiraed giving land to Bishop Eardwulf "with the advice and consent of my principal men." Thenceforth, in the Heptarchic Kingdoms, and in the United Kingdoms of Egbert and Alfred which succeeded them, clear down to the Roman Conquest, we find this formula in continual use to express the action of the royal council, interchangeably indeed with others, such as "consent and license." The language is indeed Latin—"consilium" and "consensus" or "assensus," the words used. The former, when French became the tongue of statutes, was at once translated into "advis," or rarely "conseil." The actual force of the formula, as I have said, varied with the relative strength of Council and King. The theoretical meaning, since the Council was more then of a cabinet than of a parliament, must have been that which many of our modern Senators seem desirous of establishing—advice by those most competent or affected, consent by the majority. This was accurately expressed by Hlodhari, of Kent, in 675, "with the advice of the venerable Archbishop Theodore and the consent of my principal men." Perhaps the phrase was used in its more modern meaning when, in 774, according to the contemporary chronicle, Alcred, King of Northumbria, "by the advice and consent of all his people, deprived of the society of the royal family and of the principal men, exchanged the majesty of empire for exile."

During the first century of despotism after the Norman conquest "assent" appears in Bishop Stubbs's 'Select Charters' but once. But the "Witenagemot," as the Great Council of the King, still exists, and that the traditions of its former dignity are handed down is shown by the reappearance of the ancient form for expressing its will when the King's misfortunes have again made its will worth expressing. Henry II. issues the Forest Assize of 1184, "by the advice and assent of the archbishops, bishops, barons, earls, and nobles of England." John acknowledges that his subjects are to be taxed "by the common advice and assent of our council." The revolutionary "Provisions" of 1259 under Henry III. are made "by the common advice and consent of the said King and the magnates." In that century these words were evidently the technically accurate description of legislative action. The greatest English mediæval lawyer, Bracton, says: "The laws of England cannot be changed or destroyed without the common advice and consent of all those by whose advice and consent they were promulgated." They are so familiar in statutes of this period

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

that learned jurists and historians, like Lord Campbell and Bishop Stubbs, sometimes unconsciously import them into documents where they do not belong.

A peculiarity of English struggles for progress was always that they purported to be struggles to regain privileges, real or supposed, of olden time. Under the Normans the people strove for the laws of King Alfred or King Ethelred. They stood out for the old rights and for the old formulas. Their liberties were reëstablished during the long contests of Plantagenet days, and during these the Great Council changed from a cabinet into the present Parliament. It is characteristic that when the contest was won, although the Assembly's original advisory duties had passed to its offshoot, the Privy Council or Ministry, and although the monarch no longer presided or assisted in initiating or shaping its measures, but had himself become rather the advising and consenting party, nevertheless the enacting clause of the legislative decree settled back into the ancient form which had pronounced the deposition of Alcred and the humiliation of John. The changes which had made this form delusive had been so gradual as to be unnoticed. The King, through his Chancellor, asked the "advice" of his great Council; the two houses "advised" each other, although now by the established method of first, second, and third reading and final vote; together they sent up their combined "advice" to the King, although now in the shape of a bill which must be taken whole or not at all. This last and crowning victory of the Commons, the substitution of the unalterable "bill" for the ancient "petition," which the King could mangle before signing, was achieved in the reign of Henry VI.; and simultaneously the enacting clause takes much its present shape: "De ladvis et assent des Seigneurs espirituelx et temporelx & les communes d'Engleterre esteantz en le dit Parlement, & par auctorite de mesme le Parlement." And so, except for variations between Henry VII. and Charles II., it has remained to the present year of Queen Victoria, under whom the enacting clause of every statute reads, "Be it therefore enacted and declared by the Queen's most Excellent Majesty, *by and with the advice and consent* of the Lords Spiritual and Temporal, and Commons, in this present Parliament assembled, and by the authority of the same." When a lawyer familiar with British statute-books means to express the action of a legislative body in acting on a recommendation from the executive he naturally falls into the formula "*by and with the advice and consent.*" That statute-book was thumbed by every American lawyer in 1787. It has not even yet disappeared from the law of our land. Mr. Alexander, in his recent collection of British statutes still in force in the State of Maryland, indexes fifty-three of the period since the Restoration alone.

Nearly the same form had been used before the Revolution in the Parliamentary enactments of New York, Delaware, Maryland, North Carolina, South Carolina, and Georgia. Thus the old statutes of North Carolina opened: "Be it enacted by His Excellency Gabriel Johnston, Esq., Governour, by and with the advice and consent of his Majesty's Council and General Assembly of this Province, and it is hereby enacted by the authority of the same." At first in South Carolina: "Be it enacted by His Excellency John Lord Granville Palatine and the rest of the true and absolute Lords and Proprietors of this Province, by and with the advice and consent of the General Assembly now met at Charleston."

The words "advice and consent" had been less familiarly used before 1787 to express the action of a council or legislative body in confirming nominations, because such action was not common. It had never become a settled right of the English Parliament. St. Dunstan was made Archbishop by the King "with the respect of God and the advice of the wise men." By the ephemeral Ordinances forced upon Edward II. in 1310 he was to appoint officers "with the advice and assent of the baronage." Earls were sometimes so created in that century. Knights of the Shire, or representatives in Parliament, were "elected" by the Sheriff with the "assent and arbitrament" of the county court. By a curious sporadic use of the term the by-laws of Belfast were to be made by the "sovereign and burgesses" of that city, with the "advice and consent" of Arthur Lord Chichester and his heirs. None of the above instances can have any bearing on our Constitution. But the words "advice and consent" were used in the Constitutions of four States—Massachusetts, New York, Maryland, and South Carolina—to express the action of the Council in confirming the appointments of the Governor. It remains to examine whether in these cases the words had any other meaning than the usual one of "affirmance by vote," and, if so, how large an element such altered meaning constituted in the mind of the Convention.

Of the practice in Maryland and South Carolina I have no information. That in New York, under the Constitution of 1777, it was the settled practice for the Governor first to nominate and the Council subsequently to vote, we have on the high authority of its early Governors Clinton and Jay. But the provision in the Federal Constitution grew probably out of a motion of Mr. Nathaniel Gorham, of Massachusetts, and it is therefore to the latter State that we must principally look. On July 18, 1787, Mr. Gorham moved "that the judges be *nominated and appointed* by the Executive, by and with the *advice and consent* of the second branch; and every such *nomination* shall be made at least —— days prior to such *appointment.*". "This mode," the mover said, "had been ratified by the experience of a hundred and forty years in Massachusetts." We shall see that no one could have been better informed than himself as to the Massachusetts practice, and that in his mind the nomination was an affair of the Governor alone.

The Massachusetts Council was established in 1644. Its part in the appointing power was first formally recognized in the charter of 1691 as follows: "And wee doe further Grant and Ordeyne that it shall and may be lawfull for the said Governour, with the *advice and consent* of the Councill or assistants, from time to time to *nominate and appoint* Judges . . . *Provided alwayes* that noe such *nominacion or appointment* of officers be made without notice first given or summons yssued out seaven dayes before such *Nominacion or Appointment* vnto such of the said Councillors or Assistants as shall be at that time resideing within Our said Province." We may notice here that the present distinction between "nomination" and "appointment" was not recognized in the seventeenth century. Thus in Maryland, in 1639, the Assembly provided that certain officers should be "nominated and appointed" by the Lieutenant Governor or Chief Judge. In 1642 the Governor was authorized by Lord Baltimore to "nominate, elect, and appoint" a Lieutenant Governor. In New Hampshire, in 1680, the President and Council were together to "choose, nominate, and appoint" such officers as they should think fit and necessary. Thus, too, back in 1304, King Edward I., combining the operations of a modern political campaign, "nominated and elected" William de Hamilton to be his Lord Chancellor.

From the wording of the old charter the Massachusetts practice was not clear. But Mr. Gorham had long held high official position in colony and State, and his statement that the practice had been unvaried shows that the nomination and appointment had become regarded as separate acts. The same statement shows that the nomination had been the exclusive privilege of the Executive, for in 1780, when the colonial charter was recast into a State Constitution, the proviso above quoted had been rewritten, on the proposition, apparently unopposed, of a committee, of which Mr. Gorham himself was a prominent member, to read as follows: "*Every such nomination shall be made by the Governor,* and made at least seven days prior to such appointment." The word "advice" must therefore have been a superfluity in the Council's equipment. And although the constitutional schemes of Hamilton and Pinckney contained in their corresponding provisions the word "consent" alone, I have not found that any comment was made on the addition of "advice" in Mr. Gorham's motion, or in the clause as finally adopted. Mr. Gorham's motion was lost, however, by a tie vote, and in the draft afterward submitted to the Convention by the "Committee of Detail," some offices were to be filled by the Senate alone, some by the President alone. Consideration of these clauses was postponed, and they were finally recommitted to the eleven selected on August 31, to revise all passages not yet acted upon. The latter Committee adopted Mr. Gorham's proposal in the amended form which has now become the fundamental law of the land.

We have seen that from the formula, "The President, by and with the advice and consent of the Senate," a signature by the President and a vote by the Senate, just as in the case of a legislative enactment, would naturally be inferred by the lawyers of the Convention. But the first impression would be that, as in the case of a legislative enactment, the vote would come first and the signature afterward; in other words, that the Senate would pass a resolution naming somebody, which the President might then approve or veto. It is noteworthy that the principal change made by the Committee of Eleven in Mr. Gorham's proposition was to give the President distinctly the right to nominate alone, and to make the "advice and consent," or affirmative vote of the Senate, a subsequent matter. Mr. Gouverneur Morris, the special champion of this clause, answered the objection that the Senate were given too much power by saying: "They are now to appoint judges *nominated to them* by the President"; and again, that "as the President was to *nominate*, there would be responsibility; as the Senate was to *concur*, there would be security."

The word "advice" is therefore to be treated historically, and not literally. It is interesting to note the result of past experiments at a literal treatment. The Council in New York which I have spoken of was a council of appointment exclusively. Having no other powers, it sought every means of increasing this particular power. It has the main credit in history of introducing the "spoils system" into this country. The Federalist Council of 1794 seized hold of the word "advice," and against the solemn protest of the Republican Governor, George Clinton, made the Federalist Benson a Supreme Court Judge without any previous nomination, allowing to Clinton but an equal vote with each other member of the Council. The Republican "Clinton-Spencer Council" of 1801, which marks an epoch in the development of the spoils system, turned the tables on the Federalist Governor, John Jay. It refused to vote on his nominations. Jay refused to put to vote any nomination by a councilman. To break the deadlock a convention was called, of which Aaron Burr was the presiding officer, and which, as the politicians of both parties were now committed, passed a declaratory act in the

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Council's favor. The working was such that the Constitutional Convention of 1821 resolved unanimously, without debate, to abolish the Council altogether.

We may, perhaps, give social standing to the word "advice" in constitutions and enacting clauses by considering it to be used in its reflexive or intransitive sense, referring to the mature deliberation of the parliamentary action. In this sense it appears in the now disused English royal veto, "*le roy s'avisera*"; and in the note made on the English court records when decision after an argument is reserved, "*Curia advisari vult*"; and in the exclamation of a famous Gentleman of Verona,

> "How shall I dote on her with more advice
> That thus without advice begin to love her?"

In a few constitutions the word advice is used of the Council, standing alone. This is the case in New Hampshire and Massachusetts. It would be interesting to learn whether the Council's prerogative of advice has any practical value. I do not know that the question has ever been mooted in this country. It would be hard to find a remedy for a snubbed majority of councillors. They are an Advisory Board of Pardons in Massachusetts; but, as a disrespectful delegate said of them in the last Constitutional Convention, "they have not got the consenting power, and if they have not got that they have not got the forbidding power." In Canada the Council has similar advisory powers by the Dominion Constitution or "British North America Act, 1867." The Governor-General has always claimed the right to decide on his own responsibility, and this right was endorsed by the home Government in its instructions to Lord Dufferin and the Marquis of Lorne. The same practice holds throughout the British colonies. Their privy councils are modelled after that of the mother country, by and with whose advice her Majesty does business; like it, they are composed for executive purposes of the Ministry for the time being; like it, they consider their advice in no way legally binding; but like it, when their advice is not taken, they think it proper immediately to retire into private life. Perhaps it was merely in the logical sequence of their privy-council theory of their own position that those unfortunate New York Senators acted, whose resignation because their unasked advice was not respected by President Garfield will be, from the sad event which followed, so long remembered by this nation.

EDWARD B. WHITNEY.

NEW YORK, January 29.

REALISM AND IDEALISM.

TO THE EDITOR OF THE NATION:

SIR: Mr. Kenyon Cox's challenge of my position as to the above subject is one which it gives me unusual pleasure to take up, for it is not often that one can find a disputant on art matters who is at once practically learned and theoretically wise enough to make a discussion really fruitful, and because the objections of a man who, like Mr. Cox, is both, enable me to see my own system of art philosophy more clearly. But to cover the ground so completely as to answer all the objections that I myself can foresee, would require a treatise, and I will try only to answer those which Mr. Cox has raised.

He admits that music is the most purely ideal of the arts, and that no relation to the real can be found in it. But if art in any form is governed by the same law and the same abstract definition, then plastic art, like music, must abide by the law as to the relation of nature with art. The whole difficulty lies in the determining exactly what in any art-production is due to nature and what to art. In music this is easy. If a composer should write, say, a pastorale, in which the songs of birds and the bleating of sheep came in, he would inevitably isolate them, for the most uneducated ear would reject them from a harmony, and see that in a musical sense they do not wed with any melody—they are natural, and the reproduction of them will not be art but artifice, *i. e.*, imitation, which is the more successful as it is more deceptive, or, in other words, the more it resembles nature the less it partakes of the ideal.

I have not used the word naturalistic, the meaning of which Mr. Cox makes crucial, in any exact sense, but as indicating a general tendency to receive inspiration from nature rather than from the ideal, the source of pure art. The antithesis I make is realism and idealism, and in the three cases of the occurrence of the word "naturalistic" I might have used "realistic" without affecting my argument: it means simply a larger kind of realism, not necessarily illusive, as all pure and successful realism must be. The true meaning of naturalism is, of course, that which looks to nature, and so may be used of the art of painting as opposed to that of music, or the art of Greece as opposed to that of Assyria.

Mr. Cox's "contribution to the desired solution" will help me to answer more fully all his objections to mine. "[The art of] painting has two distinct sides: a purely ideal side, corresponding to music, and a purely realistic or imitative side. A work of absolute idealism would have to be confined to the mere *musical* arrangement of colors and lines. . . . On the contrary, a work of pure realism would be the literal imitation, as closely as possible, of natural objects without any choice, arrangement, or composition. *This we should recognize as painting but not as art.*" Here, and not in the meaning of naturalism, is the crux of the problem. "The art of painting" is, accurately speaking, a misnomer, though so universally used as to make it seem scientific as it may be indispensable; but in an investigation like the present the proper term would be "art *in* painting," because art is a constant term which combines with various elements, and makes what we loosely call the art of painting, of music, of dancing, of poetry, etc., but in every case the art is to be separated from the variable element—which may be thought, as in poetry; motion, as in dancing; external nature, the visible creation, as in painting; or sound, as in music. In every case art must have material to work with, in default of which it remains not merely ideal but incommunicable, like pictures conceived or music thought over to one's self, of which we cannot judge and can say nothing. But as music may avoid all naturalistic suggestion, so may painting avoid all natural form, as when Turner painted an illustration of Goethe's theory of colors, which I have never seen, but which I am told was "very beautiful" in color, and, *pace* Mr. Cox, it was painting, and any such work in pigment would be nothing but painting, though a Turkish rug would not.

Now idealism (in painting) is that form of color-art in which the materials, whether in harmonies of line or color, or of the arrangements in light and dark, are objects existing in nature, possibly, and possibly purely fantastic, but in the production of which the reproduction of nature is not the object, but in which the expression of ideal qualities or conceptions is aimed at alone, nature being only a means. Naturalism is simply the acceptation of nature as the dominant but not necessarily exclusive source of inspiration; while realism is the negation of art, devotion to the reproduction of Nature as they see and know her generally who have correct vision: its extreme expression is illusion. Now painting may be either of these, or, as Mr. Cox puts it, "we have in the art of painting these two elements constantly combined in constantly varying degrees"; but I do not agree with him in his succeeding statement about "*pure* realism and *pure* idealism being almost impossible to find," because they are perfectly easy to find, though for obvious reasons not common; few people caring to have pictures like Turner's illustration of Goethe, or those merely realistic, *i. e.*, illusive—work which is possible only with ignoble objects and pleases only ignoble tastes People will accept music which is purely ideal, but they will not look at pictures of which they do not recognize some element of nature, because they have not yet learned to dissociate art and nature in painting as they have in music. But if ever the time should come when the public taste should be so highly cultivated that we might recognize synchromies as we now do symphonies, and enjoy passages of color as we do movements in a sonata, we should find that color-art was quite as ideal as sound-art—*i. e.*, quite as capable of existence dissociated from nature.

I do not accept Mr. Cox's definition of naturalism—viz., "the reconciliation and presence, in the same work of art, of the two elements, realism and idealism"—because I should maintain that naturalism has not necessarily any relation whatever to idealism, but is, on the contrary, the parent of realism; and Mr. Cox admits this logically when he goes on to say that a perfect work of art should be idealistic and yet "carried out with an almost [why not quite?] deceptive realism." In this case the ideal, and the strain of the imagination, would be to reproduce nature, which is not the end of art. Anything approaching deceptive color cannot be art color. It may be more pleasing to the mind of the observer, it *may be* better, but it is not the same or mistakable for it. A nature without the possibility of an accidental imperfection, and free from the encumbrance of matter, may be ideal, but we do not know of any such, and so we must fall back on that we are familiar with. I regard naturalism as a tendency of the mind which must underlie all plastic art, simply because nature is the aggregate of what we see and from which we derive our impressions; but I can conceive no great art limited by nature, much less as realistic. The color of Turner in its highest artistic development is distinctly non-natural; it would be impossible for nature, dealing with the laws of matter, to produce the color which Turner developed from his ideal world. Nor would Titian's color be consistent with a realistic landscape. He might have painted a Venus which, both in form and color, should be realistic, but it could not have been Titianesque at the same time. The glow of his flesh color is distinctly non-naturalistic—much more, then, unreal; and in my judgment Turner and Titian are the highest reaches of ideal color we know of. Mr. Cox might differ with me in this, but it would be a difference of illustration, not of principle, I believe.

It is only possible to treat such questions in the abstract. We may use concrete examples as illustrations, but not as arguments, since no two men will agree in the way of looking at any artist or work of art. Mr. Cox speaks of Pheidias as "having attained a resemblance to the actual quality of flesh never equalled before or since in sculpture," though we know of no piece of work from the hand of Pheidias by which we can judge; but, according to the evidence of Greek critics, this was not the attribute of his work, but of that of later artists, Praxiteles and Scopas; and certainly, of the statues remaining to us, the "Venus of Milo" surpasses in this quality all others. Giotto, again, did not return to nature in the sense of drawing from nature, for to my mind there is abundant internal evidence that he never studied direct from nature. But the idea that he was separated from the Byzantine school

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED.

by being less "ideal" is one which is inconsistent with the history of the arts. The Byzantine school was not ideal, but conventional and prescriptive. The artists had set types to follow, for all sacred themes, and Giotto conceived them independently and otherwise than the set types; but the distinction does not touch the question of realism and idealism. However, I do not admit to Mr. Cox "that the succeeding artists were constantly approaching nearer and nearer to realistic truth," because their method was purely and simply ideal, according to the distinction which Mr. Cox accepts between the actual and the ideal. We see no internal evidence of a realistic method of study until Titian, and with him only in portraiture. The artists after Giotto became more intellectual, and art had much greater vitality, but did not change its method. What "made possible" the great ideal work of the Cinquecento was the gradual development of higher technical excellence than Italian art had ever known, and a quite unprecedented encouragement of art in all directions, bringing in many more artists and of a higher intellectual power than ever before. It was, as in the time of Pericles in Greece, collective effort, vigorous emulation, and cumulative triumphs—a live movement of a real school, in which men were inspired by a common enthusiasm. These are what "made possible" Titian and Raphael as well as a sound ideal method of study.

I have trespassed too far on the number of the *Nation* which may contain this to follow out all the suggestions and questions of Mr. Cox's thoughtful letter; but one more point I cannot leave unnoticed in justice to my own views. I consider the *best* period of Italian ideal art that from Masaccio to Raphael, but not at all *because* of the "lack of expression and individuality of head," but because these are the indications of a pure idealistic method and noble ideal types. The Greek sculptors of the best period show the same characteristics, and I should therefore go back further even than Cimabue; but Giotto is far enough, and he marks the advent of the distinctively Italian school of painting, and is generally considered, incorrectly, a naturalistic painter. For that reason I singled him out as purely idealistic.

W. J. Stillman.

London, January 23, 1886.

SOUTHERN OPPOSITION TO THE BLAIR BILL.

To the Editor of The Nation:

Sir: While renewing my subscription to the *Nation* for the ensuing year, permit me, a native of the South and a resident of New Orleans for twenty years, to express my earnest approval of your editorial in No. 1073 on "Federal Aid to Education." I withdrew from the Louisiana Educational Society because its directors persisted in clamoring for an appropriation from the Federal Treasury and advocated the passage of the Blair Bill. More than a year ago I maintained, in a public session of the Society, that if we could have free trade and free ships, and could teach the people of Louisiana to rely on themselves, instead of looking to the Federal Government as a *deus ex machina*, from whom all blessings flow, we could easily raise at home all the money we needed for schools, with the immense advantage of having the people realize that the money comes out of their own pockets, and have them look after its expenditure themselves.

There are thousands of Southern people heartily with you in your efforts for (1) civil-service reform, (2) elimination of the "protective" features of the tariff, *i. e.*, a tariff only for revenue, and (3) a repeal of the Bland silver-coinage act of 1878. Many of your subscribers here would be glad to see more discussion of the tariff, synthetic and constructive, as well as analytic and destructive. When the free-traders, Professor Sumner, Mr. Philpott, and others, appeared before the Tariff Commission in 1882, they had admirable criticisms of the existing tariff, destructive of the arguments of the protectionists; but when asked to propose a system of revenue to substitute for it, they, with the exception of Mr. Thomas G. Shearman, of New York, had no plan to offer.

In closing, I venture to protest against the injurious remarks you make in No. 1073 about the trade of New Orleans. In many directions New Orleans has advanced during the last seven years. The city never exported 70 per cent. of the cotton, and now exports more than 26 per cent. including through-trade—that is, cotton compressed in the interior and transferred direct from cars to ships. It never imported 80 per cent. of the coffee. It is not going down hill relatively nor absolutely. Not one-tenth of the sums spent upon the harbor of New York has been spent upon the harbor of New Orleans. You say: "The badness of the soil and climate and the harbor are killing New Orleans by inches." The soil for one hundred miles down and many hundred miles up the river is of the most inexhaustible fertility. I was brought up in the blue-grass region of Kentucky, and know what good soil is, and after wide observation I think that no soil is of such deep and inexhaustible fertility as that of the country tributary to New Orleans. The harbor here is very fine—deep and perfectly safe, and is fuller of ships than ever.

The greatest drawback to our port is the high war tariff, which compels the ships to come here in ballast for outward cargo. As to the climate, it is cool in summer, fanned by the Gulf breezes, temperature often never rising above 87° during the summer, and rarely above 90°; no sunstrokes; usually warm in winter. In no city in the United States are the variations of temperature so small. The death-rate among the whites is only 22 per 1,000 per annum. The proportion of people past eighty years is very large. I have brought up a family of six children, usually staying here all the year round, and never had a case of malarial or other fever.

I do not ask you to publish this letter, but in view of your wide circulation and immense influence, I do ask you to correct the injustice you have done our city.

Respectfully, your obedient servant,

B. P. Forman.

New Orleans, January 25, 1886.

A GREEK PLAY AT THE UNIVERSITY OF PENNSYLVANIA.

To the Editor of The Nation:

Sir: I wish to call the attention of those readers of the *Nation* who are interested in the study of the Greek language and life, to the efforts which are being made at the University of Pennsylvania to diffuse the knowledge of Hellenic life and character by bringing out a Greek play in Philadelphia. This project was first mooted among the students before the last summer vacation. The professor of Comparative Philology, Dr. Morton W. Easton, immediately set about the preliminary arrangements. It was at once decided that the play to be performed should be a comedy of Aristophanes, and after some discussion the play selected was "The Acharnians." Mr. Hugh A. Clarke, the Professor of Music, devoted his summer vacation to the composition of suitable music for the choruses. It was understood that the principal parts in the cast would be filled by competition, and some of the students therefore spent the summer in preparing themselves for it.

Early in the winter a large meeting was held of the alumni interested in the matter, together with some of the professors and the principal competitors among the students. At this meeting the selection of the play was ratified; and it was decided to give two performances, the first on the evening of Friday, May 14th, and the second—a matinée—on the following day. Various sub-committees to aid in the work were appointed by Provost Pepper, who presided. A short time afterwards the first competition took place, and those students who were the most promising were assigned to the principal speaking characters. Since then the entire cast has been filled from a list of over seventy competitors. A chorus of twenty-four voices has been selected in like manner, but inasmuch as this number would hardly give a sufficient volume of sound to fill the Academy of Music, where the performance is to take place, it is proposed to have a supplementary chorus of about fifty voices seated in front of the stage. The training of the orchestra will begin in due time. Those having the play in charge have endeavored to be beforehand in their preparations; and as far as the actors and chorus are concerned, no effort has been spared to give to the inexperienced amateurs who take part all the time they need for preparation. The costumes and properties are now being made. The scenery, which is now being painted by Mr. Russell Smith, will give a perfect representation of an Athenian street, and will include some of the best examples of plain Doric and Ionic buildings, such as the Theseion, the Erechtheion, and the Temple of Ilyssus, with a distant view of the Acropolis. The selection of a comedy is of course of the nature of an experiment. Representations of the Greek tragedies have been given in England; but comedies have not been by any means so frequently produced, and even in Germany such performances are comparatively rare. So far as my knowledge goes a Greek comedy has never been given in America.

Among the comedies of Aristophanes, "The Acharnians" is beyond all question the best for a modern audience. It is comparatively free from coarseness, and not more than twenty lines will have to be omitted on that account. There is great variety of action; there are no long dialogues, as in other comedies of Aristophanes. Historically, it is extremely interesting, although "The Clouds" is more frequently read in colleges because of its interest for students of philosophy. I believe that "The Acharnians" is a better educator for a nineteenth-century audience composed of people who, if they take any interest in the matter at all, are likely to take more in the thirty years' struggle between Athens and Sparta than in the estimate placed upon Socrates and his philosophy by the Athenian rabble.

The committee in charge of the play will be extremely happy to receive suggestions from those who take an interest in the performance; and they will gladly furnish any information to those who desire to witness the play.

Respectfully yours,

Thomas Robins, jr.

729 Walnut St., Philadelphia, February 2, 1886.

A SWARTHMORE CONGRESS.

To the Editor of The Nation:

Sir: You have given much of your valuable space to the subject of the Johns Hopkins House of Commons. I hope you will find room for a short account of an institution we have here at Swarthmore College that we consider more American and practicable. It is a Congress, composed of a Senate and House of Representatives, chosen in the following manner: Each of the four classes elects a certain number of delegates to the Electoral College. This body elects a Presi-

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

dent, who writes a message, and signs or vetoes bills, from the Faculty. Then the delegations from the different classes ballot separately for members of the upper chamber, the Freshman class electing two, Sophomores three, Juniors four, and Seniors five. This makes fourteen Senators. The remaining delegates, numbering twenty-five, compose the House of Representatives. Each Congressman is assigned to a certain State, whose interests it is his duty to look after. The States are fairly distributed geographically. The rules of the national House and Senate, slightly modified, govern the two bodies. The roll of States is called for the introduction of bills on the first meeting in each month, and all bills are referred to the appropriate committees. We meet about once a week in the large study hall, where the galleries are set apart for visitors. The President, Senators, and Representatives hold their office for one year. Among other bills passed was one "To Suspend the Coinage of Silver," "To Improve the Civil Service," "To Regulate the Salaries of United States Deputy Marshals," and to appropriate money to build a monument to General Grant. W.

SWARTHMORE COLLEGE.

THE SILVER FRAUD.

TO THE EDITOR OF THE NATION:

SIR: Please pardon me the egotism of opening this letter with some words about myself. I do so because my case is typical of many belonging to my class, and serves to place in a strong light the helplessness of non-voting taxpayers against fraud of every description, especially a great national fraud such as the champions of silver are seeking to perpetrate.

I have been supporting myself for thirteen years, and during that time have made, by my own labor, without speculation of any sort, near $12,000; yet to-day I am still a working woman, with barely $3,000 between me and utter poverty should sickness put a stop to my activity. This, you may say, is the result of my own bad management; but the only mistake committed in any of my investments, so far as I can see, is due to the fact that they were all based upon the necessary assumption that somebody or something could be trusted.

My first loss was in an Alabama cotton mill, whose president speculated with the funds, and contrived, through some legal sleight of hand which I never understood, to shift his losses upon the stockholders. I next invested in railroad stock of one of the oldest and solidest corporations in the State. I bought at 96, and in a few months the stock had dropped to 66. I afterward tried bank stock, with results akin to my cotton-mill experiment.

I now determined to invest in land, as the only absolutely safe thing. I accordingly purchased, for $3,000, one hundred and forty acres on the outskirts of a pretty village, intending there to establish a dairy farm. After laying out several hundred dollars in improvements, I suddenly lost my health, and spent the better part of fourteen months in bed, supporting myself by writing with my hands propped on a pillow, and by having pupils come and recite at my bedside. In the meantime, my land was uncultivated, my fences burnt by negroes for fire-wood, and one hundred choice fruit trees I had planted trampled down by other people's cattle, so that I was glad to sell out at a loss of $500. The purchaser paid $500 cash, giving for the remainder his notes secured by the land. I have not collected these notes as they fell due, because good notes, secured by real estate, seemed to me a safer investment than the land itself, and, like women generally, I care more for safety than for large returns from capital. Now, if our Solons at Washington decree that eighty cents shall be a dollar, will some friend of silver explain to me the equity of taking from a sick woman twenty per cent. of what she has worked for, and giving it to a man who has not worked for it? or what ultimate benefit would accrue to the country thereby? I do not know that my debtor would defraud me under any circumstances, but, in the light of past experience, I should prefer to know that he *could* not.

I have spoken of myself only, but I am one of thousands like me who are interested in having an honest dollar. It is the flattest demagogism to talk about a conspiracy of bondholders and bankers against silver. For one "bloated bondholder" who would be injured by a depreciated currency, thousands of women and children and thrifty laborers who have invested their little all in bonds and mortgages for safety would be robbed. All this outcry about the poor debtor is mere political clap-trap—as if debt could be wiped out by merely transferring the deficiency to somebody else's pocket! It is an absolute mathematical truth that every debt will assuredly be paid to the uttermost farthing, the only question being whether by the one who justly owes it or by somebody else. A LABORING WOMAN.

MACON, GA., February 4, 1886.

MITHRA THE MEDIATOR.

TO THE EDITOR OF THE NATION:

SIR: If no one else has answered the question of your correspondent "H. C. L.," in No. 1071 of your issue, respecting the character of Mithra as a mediator between Hormazd and Ahriman, may I be allowed to refer him to cap. 46 of Plutarch's 'Isis and Osiris'? He is there called a μεσίτης; and I think he was undoubtedly so regarded by Manes, who speaks of him as *Christ*.—Yours faithfully, S. B.

WARK, NORTHUMBERLAND, ENGLAND, January 22, 1886.

THE COLD IN FLORIDA.

TO THE EDITOR OF THE NATION:

SIR: It is fair to say that the full effects of the late freeze in Florida are now known. There has been a loss in income, but practically no loss in capital. The greater part of the oranges on the trees were frozen, except along the Indian River and to a certain extent in the high pine groves. From fifteen to fifty per cent. of the young nursery stock was killed. Bearing trees and those coming into bearing were practically uninjured. Some vegetables were lost, but there is time to grow another crop this season. The first feeling of alarm has passed away, and every day the injury done grows less.—Yours respectfully,

ALFRED BISHOP MASON.

JACKSONVILLE, TAMPA AND KEY WEST RAILWAY CO., JACKSONVILLE, FLA., February 1, 1886.

RADISSON'S VOYAGES.

TO THE EDITOR OF THE NATION:

SIR: It may be of interest to some readers of the *Nation* to know that in Radisson's 'Voyages'—the latest publication of the Prince Society—are references to aboriginal occupation of some places on the Richelieu River and Lake Champlain, hitherto supposed prehistoric. In 1652 Radisson was taken prisoner by some "Irokoits." While being carried by them up the "River of Richelieu," he says: "At 3 of the clock in the afternoone we came into a rappid streame, where we weare forced to land and carry our Equipages and boats thorough a dangerous place." This was evidently the rapids at and below St. Johns. "Att night, where we found Cottages ready made," reasonably points to an aboriginal village site found by me in 1883, about twelve miles above St. Johns, near Isle aux Noix. "The morning early following we marched. . . . Sejourning awhile, we came to a lake 6 leagues wide. . . . Wee arrived to a fine sandy bancke, where not long before many Cabbanes weare errected and places made where Prisoners weare tyed." This "fine sandy bancke," it seems to me, was no other than that on the bay in Plattsburgh, about thirty miles from Isle aux Noix. During the last seven years, on this bank, thousands of stone implements and weapons and bushels of fragments of pottery have been found. This sand ridge has no equal in size, location, and evidence of aboriginal occupation between St. Johns and Plattsburgh. In the night "our wild people sweated" themselves, and caroused and feasted on two bears they had killed during the day. Then they were frightened, and "embarked themselves speedily." Radisson was made to lie down "whilst they rowed very hard. I slept securely till the morning, where I found meselfe in great high rushes." He probably was in the marsh between the mouths of the Au Sable rivers, about ten miles from the "fine sandy bancke."

Radisson's different voyages and experiences are quaintly and graphically described, and may be considered fairly reliable. He twice went to the country of the "Irokoits," visited the great lakes, and also Hudson's Bay.

Yours truly, D. S. KELLOGG.

PLATTSBURGH, N. Y., February 1, 1886.

Notes.

A MEMOIR of the Rev. Manasseh Cutter, the patron saint of Ohio and the Northwest, as he might be called, is in preparation at the hands of descendants living in Marietta. In the October proceedings of the American Antiquarian Society, from which we learn this, there is a curious revelation of Sparks's apotheosis of Washington, in suppressing a sentence from a letter showing his interest in a certain Philadelphia lottery. According to the Rev. E. E. Hale, he held tickets in it; and the Rev. A. P. Peabody tells, in a report read before the Society, of Washington having been the manager of a Mountain Road lottery in 1768.

According to No. 2 of the Johns Hopkins *Modern Language Notes*, Prof. James Morgan Hart, of the University of Cincinnati, is making an exhaustive collection of Anglo-Saxon words from all existing separate lexicons, special glossaries, grammars, scientific periodicals, reviews, etc., to form ultimately a complete Anglo-Saxon lexicon.

Besides writing the life of Izaak Walton for his own series of 'English Worthies,' Mr. Andrew Lang will write the volume on St. Andrew's for the new series of 'Historic Towns.' A French translation of his sketch of Mythology, by M. Léon Parmentier, has just been published in Paris (A. Dupret; New York: F. W. Christern), with an introduction and notes by M. Charles Michel.

Ginn & Co., Boston, have in press an unabridged edition of 'Guy Mannering,' annotated for schools.

Archdeacon Farrar's new book, containing Sermons and Addresses delivered in America, a Lecture on Dante, and Farewell Thoughts on America, will be published in London on February 20, and simultaneously in New York by E. P. Dutton & Co.

Ten years ago the 'Canterbury Tales' of Harriet and Sophia Lee, revived in the edition of 1866 published by Hurd & Houghton, were already out of print, so far as the editors of the 'American Catalogue' could discover. Houghton, Mifflin & Co., the successors of that firm, have reprinted the three volumes from the plates, and whether or not the Tales will be found to have "come into fashion again," as the publish-

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

ers hoped and predicted in 1866, they can be read with pleasure either for their own sakes or for the light they throw on the times in which they first appeared. There is a fashion in the making as well as in the writing and reading of books, and the typography of the Tales, though only two decades old, has a certain antiquity of taste not unsuited to a revival.

The title of Dr. Henry M. Field's latest book of travels, 'The Greek Islands, and Turkey After the War,' has disappointment for readers who take a special interest in the Greek Islands, seeing that his description of them occupies scarcely a dozen pages. Of their present condition and prospects he says not a word, nor does he attempt to picture their scenery except in the case of Mitylene,' which, he inadvertently says, "lies midway between the shores of Asia Minor and the mainland of Greece," the fact being that it is only eight miles from the coast of Asia Minor at its nearest point. Dr. Field's impressions of Constantinople in 1882 are interesting, as he not only is a good observer, but had unusually favorable opportunities for forming an intelligent opinion. The closing chapters relate briefly the causes and principal events in the war of 1877, and a few unimportant incidents and impressions during his ride across Bulgaria and Rumania.

The huge memorial volume, 'One Hundred Years of Temperance, 1785-1885' (National Temperance Society), is a haystack of facts which cannot be called readable in their present form, and which ought to be worked over by one mind into something distinct and impressive. No editor's name is attached to the book, and there is little evidence of editing except in the mere arrangement. We will give one example of the imperfection of the present scheme. A chapter on the temperance press might naturally have been looked for, but it is lacking, and where shall one turn to find the first temperance paper? There is no index, and one must know that the name of that paper was the *National Philanthropist*, and its editor William Collier, a Baptist clergyman, to seek the desired information under "A Century of Church Work—The Baptist Church."

The Earl of Iddesleigh has published (New York: Scribner & Welford) a discourse on 'The Pleasures, the Dangers, and the Uses of Desultory Reading,' which he read as Lord Rector to the students of the University of Edinburgh last November. The newly-ennobled lecturer dwelt on the advantages of varying the kind of books one should read, citing Dr. Johnson, Bacon, Carlyle, and Arnold, of Rugby, as to the absolute utility of desultory reading, and its indisputable advantage over reading rigidly restricted to the main work of a man's life. Incidentally he gave interesting evidence as to his own actions: "I never read so many novels in succession as during the months that I was working for my degree at the rate of ten or twelve hours a day; and in the week when I was actually under examination I read through the 'Arabian Nights' in the evening." Sir Stafford urges again the sound advice that the student should "master at least one subject of study by sheer hard work, without the aid of any of the ingenious inventions for saving time and trouble which are so dangerously tempting." As to the mass of new books of more or less value, his suggestions are equally sound, if not more novel; he does not quote Emerson's advice, not to read anything not a year old; but he does quote Lowell's kindred epigram: "For reading new books is like eating new bread: one can bear it at first, but by gradual steps he is brought to death's door by mental dyspepsy."

The bound volumes of the *Critic* for last year are numbered III. and IV. of the new series. The chief feature of our weekly contemporary, apart from its reviews and its selections from other periodicals, is a leading article, generally signed, and generally on a literary subject. The papers called "Authors at Home" have been extended from five to fifteen, and with them may be classed one on Bret Harte's estimation in Germany, a celebration of Mark Twain's fiftieth birthday, Mr. Gosse's notes on America, a talk with Froude on his arrival, etc. Sometimes the article becomes an obituary, as in the case of Richard Grant White, Victor Hugo, Grant, McClellan, and "H. H." Sometimes it touches on politics, as when treating of the Riel rebellion, the Anglo-Russian crisis last spring, the Caroline Islands dispute, the abolition of duties on works of art, etc. Arbor Day forms another topic, and Francis Parkman commemorates the 200th anniversary of the Revocation of the Edict of Nantes.

Two volumes of the *Sanitarian*, also, the 14th and 15th (New York: A. N. Bell), are on our table. The contents consist to a large extent of papers by professional men, which are at least suggestive when not authoritative. We cannot well summarize the topics, but we have been especially interested in a paper on "The Ultimate of Sanitation by Fire."

Mr. Francis Rawle's paper on "Car Trust Securities" (Philadelphia: Thos. S. Dando & Co.), read at the meeting of the American Bar Association last August, has been reprinted from the transactions of that body, in a fair pamphlet of nearly fifty pages. It is a clear and valuable presentation of the law on a novel and useful but perilous form of security. There are some remarks, near the end, "as to the commercial aspect" of this sort of investment, which will have a bitter but wholesome interest for many investors; for it is certain that car trusts have in particular instances proved to be an engine for hoisting money out of the investor hardly inferior to the mock auction itself. That the analogy here suggested is not a necessary one, Mr. Rawle plainly shows. Indeed, the victims themselves would probably confess it; and after reserving, perhaps, a certain quantity of peculiar damnation for their advisers, even they would allow that the fault was not (if we may be pardoned the expression) in their cars, but in themselves, that they were taken in. Very interesting questions as to the law of conditional sales and chattel mortgages are illustrated in this pamphlet, and we commend its brief and intelligent discussion to the legal reader.

The second edition of the 'Random Recollections' of Mr. Henry B. Stanton has been considerably enlarged, and repairs to some extent the most noticeable defect in the first edition, viz.: its slurring over the author's connection with the anti-slavery agitation. In this portion we remark an erroneous date, on page 37—"1839" for "1836." But our octogenarian's mind, unlike that of old people in general, prefers to linger on his later experience, as a lawyer, a politician, or journalist, and no one will deny that he has much that is entertaining to recall. He attended the most epoch-making party conventions; he saw John Quincy Adams stricken with death in the House of Representatives; he has written the obituaries of many famous men and women—he enumerates them with a survivor's satisfaction. Gerrit Smith's was one of these. Mr. Stanton took the risk of printing it in the *Sun* on the morning of the day when (as it proved) the venerable philanthropist breathed his last. "Mr. Stanton," said the night editor that afternoon, "that was one of the grandest newspaper beats that ever happened in New York! And how fortunate it is for us that Mr. Smith died to-day! It would have been very embarrassing if he had recovered." Alas for the truth of history! As we have heard Mr. Stanton relate the story, the words were: "Glorious old Gerrit Smith! he never went back on us!"

D. C. Heath & Co., Boston, send us an outline map of the United States, in four sections and as many sheets, the joint product of Dr. Albert B. Hart and Mr. Edward Channing. The size is large, each sheet measuring 29 by 42 inches, with the intent to be tacked to a wall and colored or inscribed according to the lecturer's needs. In this way history, geography, and geology can be taught progressively, by a liberal use of sheets. The idea is an excellent one, and the publication deserves the support of teachers.

From D. Lothrop & Co., Boston, we have two more examples of their series of "*Wide Awake* Art Prints"—"Wild Ducks," by Charles Volkmar, and "In Holland," by F. Childe Hassam. These, like their predecessors, are a reproduction in photogravure by the Lewis Co. of original designs in color for *Wide Awake;* and as the latter have already been engraved on wood, a very interesting comparison is afforded.

"But why this talk about 'compulsory' prayers?" asks the *Unitarian*, the new sectarian monthly of Chicago, apropos of "the annual movement against morning prayers at Harvard." "No! Let the question be argued fairly—simply of 'prayers.'" But why "annual" movement (we ask in turn), and not daily or perennial movement? We cite this absurd language merely because the *Unitarian* purports to offer (in the words of Channing displayed at its head) "a purer, higher form of Christianity, . . . such as will approve itself to men of profound *thinking* and feeling."

We have received from David G. Francis the January number of the *Antiquary*, containing at least two articles of first-rate importance. The opening article is by Hubert Hall, and is entitled "Notes on the History of the Crown-Lands." The present article, "Part I., Introduction," treats of the external history of these lands—that is, their origin (principally in the conversion of Folk-land into *Terra Regis*), and their disposition—the gradual misappropriation of this property by being bestowed upon courtiers and favorites, until its alienation was prohibited by an act passed after the Revolution. The crown-lands, he thinks it probable, reached their greatest extent in the reign of Henry II. The other principal article is one of Mr. Bickley's upon "Celebrated Birth-places," this being a visit to Fenny Drayton, the birth-place of George Fox. It is a very interesting description of this out-of-the-way Leicestershire village, accompanied with a number of personal incidents and memorials of Fox. Mr. Brailsford's paper, "The Wyatts of Allington Castle, Kent," is also of value, especially in the account of the poet Sir Thomas Wyatt. Other articles are: "Glimpses of Old London," "Quaint Conceits in Pottery," both well illustrated; "An Unpublished Letter from Baron Wainwright to Lady Sundon," "Wandering Englishmen," by J. Theodore Bent, and part of a series by Mr. Round, upon "Municipal Offices"; the present article being the conclusion of Colchester, and treating only of certain inferior and generally unimportant offices.

Mr. Alfred E. T. Watson ("Rapier" of the *Illustrated Sporting and Dramatic News* of which he is the editor), and the assistant editor of the "Badminton Library of Sports and Pastimes," has prepared for Messrs. Longman 'The Year's Sport: A Review of British Sports and Pastimes for the Year 1885,' a year-book which will appear regularly hereafter. In view of the enormous interest which the Englishman at home and the Briton abroad take in sport of all kinds, it is curious that such a work has not been undertaken long ago.

Curious also is it, considering the very important place held by the theatre in French life, that hitherto there has been no weekly or monthly periodical in France devoted to the drama. The

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Revue des Deux Mondes, the *Nouvelle Revue*, the *Revue Bleue*, and the other leading reviews give careful consideration to the stage. But while there were many journals of art, pictorial and plastic, and of music, there was none for the theatre. To fill this want M. Edmond Stoullig, the energetic editor of the ten-year-old 'Annales du Théâtre et de la Musique,' has now undertaken the *Revue d'Art Dramatique* (Paris: A. Dupret; New York: F.W. Christern), which is to appear on the first and fifteenth of every month. The monthly parts contain each sixty-four pages; and in make-up the new review is not unlike the *Revue des Deux Mondes* or the *Nouvelle Revue*. It is intended to discuss in its pages everything relating to the theatre, ancient and modern, in France and throughout the world. In addition to the contributed magazine essays there is a review of the current French stage, and a department for the criticism of new books about the stage. To the first two numbers M. Sarcey contributes an acute study of the actor, his peculiar qualifications and his position in society. Among the other regular contributors are M. Vitu, M. Thierry, M. Mézières, M. Charles Garnier, and M. Camille Saint-Saëns.

The custom of offering a dinner to all the persons engaged in a play on its one hundredth performance is going out in Paris; hundredth performances are too common. Dumas is thought to have given it the *coup de grâce* by substituting the gift of a copy of the play, well bound, and made precious by a copy in the author's own hand of the most striking lines of the actor to whom it is given. But M. Courtois asks how those unfortunate actors are pleased whose only speech was "Madame la baronne est servie," or "La voiture de M. le comte est avancée." Will their descendants be likely to preserve the volume as a proof of their ancestor's glory? Probably such monologists would prefer the good supper which they have lost to the best bound copy of a play in which they had so little part.

Dickens and Dumas furnish the subjects of the two leading papers in *Le Livre* for January. M. R. Du Pontavice de Heussey treats of Dickens's first visit to Paris, ingeniously piecing together, in the form of a diary or connected letters, extracts from the novelist's correspondence with Lady Blessington, Count d'Orsay, John Forster, Landor, etc. The period was 1846-'47. Among Dickens's observations, which seldom go below the surface, his impressions of persons are the most noteworthy, as in the case of Victor Hugo and the elder Dumas. The latter was already a "colossus," yet, as it happens, the portrait of him fourteen years earlier, by Déveria, accompanying the succeeding paper on his "Tour de Nesles," shows a quite slender figure and a face in which intellect predominates over sensuousness. There are two portraits of Dickens—one anonymous, at eighteen, as alleged, and the other after D'Orsay's pen sketch in 1845. His present eulogistic biographer annotates his letters intelligently for the most part, but when Dickens writes Lady Blessington of having met "Bruffam," we are told that this was the surname (*surnom*) of Lord Brougham. For surname read nickname, as a late member of the New York bar was sometimes disrespectfully called "Stufton" for Stoughton.

We have received the first issue of a *Bollettino* proceeding from the Biblioteca Nazionale Centrale of Florence. It records the accessions to that library of Italian publications derived from the copyright obligation to deposit copies (*diritto di stampo*). On the last page is an index of authors, a convenient innovation. The Victor Emanuel Library will publish periodically a complementary list of foreign works acquired by the libraries of the kingdom.

The invaluable Index of Articles upon American Local History now publishing in the Bulletin of the Boston Public Library is carried as far as the letter M in No. 72. The same number contains a classified index to the maps in the publications of the London Geological Society; an index to the pictures and plans of library buildings in the possession of the Boston Public Library; and a selected list of the subjects treated in the Parliamentary sessional papers of 1884. The gifts to this noble institution continue to be numerous and princely.

"Reference Notes on Journalism" are to be found in No. 13 of the Library Bulletin of Cornell University, which concludes, by the way, the first volume.

The commercial statistics for Chili for the year 1884, just published by the proper department, show a falling off in importations from Great Britain and France, but an increase from Germany, the United States, and Italy respectively. Though Germany exports to the republic just one-half what Great Britain does, her traders are making prodigious advances in competition with the English. They have quadrupled their exports to Chili in five years (1879-1884). In the same period the United States has tripled her exports, which are still less than half those of Germany. By far the greatest amount (about two-thirds) of Chili's exports goes to England.

Among the numerous tributes to Bismarck on his seventieth birthday was a Latin poem, recounting his various services to Germany. The following stanza celebrates the latest:

"Prosperent Imperii
Nunc intratæ viæ;
Valeat tellus amœna
Camerun, Angra-Pequena;
Vivant coloniæ."

The last German expedition into the interior of Eastern Africa, by the way, has taken six libraries for the stations, which have been specially selected and given for that purpose by a German publishing house.

—The second number of *Modern Language Notes* (Baltimore) opens with an article on native and foreign words in De Quincey, by Professor Albert S. Cook, of the University of California. Mr. Todd, one of the associate editors, writes pleasantly about Tilley's 'Literature of the French Renaissance,' a very weak book, which the reviewer is generous enough to praise without dwelling upon its slightness. Then follows a discriminating notice of Gummere's 'Handbook of Poetics,' by Professor Hart, of the University of Cincinnati. The review by Dr. Goebel of Paulsen's 'Geschichte des gelehrten Unterrichts,' as it deals with a work of the highest excellence, is more ambitious in its tone than other articles in the present number. Professor Bancroft has an interesting notice of Mr. Gosse's 'From Shakespeare to Pope.' There are, besides, philological notes and personal items giving information acceptable to those who are engaged in the teaching of modern languages. The six columns headed "Brief Mention" contain very short notices of new books, mostly German, all of a pedagogical character. There is a very good select list of recent publications, which will be found useful even to instructors who have access to the special periodicals of France or Germany. On the whole, the second number is a decided improvement upon the first. We hope the editors will not overlook the literary part of their work; the philological seems to take care of itself. There is a tendency in special journals to neglect the language in which they are written. In this respect the Germans are the greatest sinners. There is no harder, no more repulsive reading than is to be found in some of the philological journals of Germany, particularly those whose specialty is Romance languages. Let us trust that this new American monthly, devoted to the modern languages, will recognize the claims of the native speech by presenting in clear and correct English whatever subject is treated in its pages. The general appearance of the *Notes* is not as good as the contents. The typography is, to say the least, unattractive: what is gained by departing from the custom of distinguishing titles at the head of the notices by italics?

—In the notes to his recently published edition of selections from Sainte-Beuve Mr. Saintsbury translates *ne s'était trouvée à pareille fête* 'had had such a glorious time of it'; and adds, "in good old English, which some people probably think to be American." The last sentence is pleasantly ambiguous, but as Mr. Saintsbury's own English in his "George Borrow" article has recently had a severe rasping, it may be a comfort to some other foolish people to know that such a master of modern English as Dr. Jowett says, in his 'Politics of Aristotle,' page ciii: "Both women and slaves are partial to tyrannies and democracies because *they have a good time* under them." In any case, Americans are too pervasive to be kept out of the English language. The Americanism of yesterday becomes conversational English to-day and classic to-morrow. Of course this irritates people of a certain sort on both sides of the water, and an unreasonable suspicion is engendered as to every unusual word. So "'aloofness" was some time since picked out for animadversion as an American coinage, whereas a reference to the Philological Society's Dictionary would have shown the critic that it is used by Coleridge among other high English authorities—Coleridge, who had no patience with the American coinage of words, and declaimed against the injury Americans were doing the language.

—An interesting addition to Shakspere literature is a beautifully printed volume, 'The Merry Wives of Windsor, a Comedy. By William Shakespeare. Edited, with Notes from the Collections of the late John Frederick Stanford, M.A., F.R.S., by Henry B. Wheatley, F.S.A.' (London: George Bell & Sons. 1886). This play is one of those which most need and best reward illustration, as the single comedy of contemporary manners from Shakspere's hand; and it was to be hoped that Mr. Stanford, who had especially devoted himself to collecting material for this purpose, had made some curious if not important finds. The result only shows that the field is too thoroughly traversed to make it worth while for any amateur to enter it. The editor of this volume found it necessary to avail himself freely of previous work, and the consequence is an excellent edition, but distinguished only by its completeness. The part which Mr. Stanford's collections play in it is not very visible or notable. The text, however, which is in a very bad state, has been treated with rare judiciousness, and the Introduction is to be praised as a fully-informed study of the play itself, without criticism, and just what it should be. The editor differs from Mr. Daniel, the latest scholar who has written with authority on the subject, in believing that in the vague and apparently compressed misadventure of the *Host* with his horses, reference is had to the visit of Count Mümpelgart to England, and makes out an excellent case for his own view. The discussions of the opinion that *Fenton* is Shakspere's self, and of the topography of Windsor, are in the highest degree excellent. But in the very full notes one looks in vain for those "illustrations" which he is led to expect. They are usually sensible, but not often original or fresh with instruction. Sometimes the fatuity that seems to attend all commentators is to be found, as in the suggested emendation which, in the line, "half-stewed in grease, like a Dutch dish," would read *fish*. The interest shown in the puns is superfluous, as is the school-boy slang de-

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

scribing one of them as "tolerably bad"; and here and there, as so often happens, attention is attracted by explanation of words still common in America, as, for example, *taking*, both in the sense of *worry* and of *infectious*. The work, notwithstanding small defects, is the most complete, intelligent, and "up-to-date" edition of the play.

—In war history we have in this month's *Century* another instalment of General Grant's memoirs, in advance of the publication of the book, an article by General Longstreet on the campaign against Pope, with a lively paper by Mr. Redwood on a private soldier's experience in Stonewall Jackson's "foot cavalry." In addition to these formal articles, the "Memoranda" contain a number of comments and corrections of former papers, among which are two of considerable importance, viz.: Gen. W. F. Smith's statement regarding the maturing of plans for the reopening of communication with Chattanooga before General Grant assumed command there, and General Keyes's explanation of the actual organization and work of the rear guard of the Army of the Potomac, which he commanded on the retreat from Malvern Hill to Harrison's Landing. General Grant's chapter relates to his assumption of command as Lieutenant-General at the beginning of the Wilderness campaign in 1864. It is sharply and strongly characteristic, as everything from his pen has been. General Longstreet's paper is admirably written, making it hard to see how a more attractive presentation of the campaign of the "second Bull Run" could be made in the space assigned him. It contains some interesting revisions of statements formerly made by him, while maintaining in substance the views he expressed in the Porter investigation. His point of view is, of course, the Confederate one, and is based upon incomplete knowledge of Halleck's relations to Pope's movements, but is strikingly clear and unquestionably candid.

—A correspondent writes that in 1871 he went with an army paymaster on his tour of duty. An ambulance with soldiers met them in Nebraska at Grand Island Station and escorted them forty miles through an uninhabited country to Camp Ruggles on the Loup fork of the Platte. In paying the troops, the officer induced some of the men to accept certificates of deposit, with promise of interest, from the most reputable banker in Omaha, for something of their pay. He told his civilian companion that unless the privates laid up their money in some such way, it would directly burn a hole through their pockets. Safeguards against dissipation seemed absurd in such a wilderness, and in a camp where the severest penalties would be sure to smite a sutler who should sell anything stronger than boiled cider. Yet the very next morning most of the men who had made no deposits, and were not on duty, were discovered to be more or less dead drunk, and, of course, moneyless. Wherever the carcass is eagles gather; and so whiskey venders, dogging the steps of the paymaster, had broached their kegs in some neighboring lurking-place, and through sneaking go-betweens had enticed their victims from the camp. The paymaster, while glad that he had prevented something of that wilful waste which is mother of woful want, lamented that he had long labored in vain for organizing a soldiers' savings bank. The next winter that officer, Gen. Benjamin Alvord, became Paymaster-General, promoted to that position because Grant knew him to be, as Sherman had said, "as honest as God." He said that his advancement pleased him best because it would help him carry out his pet plan for the profit of private soldiers. His banking bill, disguised as "An act to prevent desertion, and to elevate the condition of the rank and file of the army," was passed, May 15, 1872. It provided that any sum from five dollars upwards should be received by paymasters, and receipted for, to be repaid on the depositor's discharge, with four per cent. interest for all sums amounting to fifty dollars—not liable for the soldier's debts, and only forfeitable in case of his desertion. It was added that, if he drew less than his allowance of clothing, its money value should be paid him with his deposit.

—After the lapse of six years Alvord, still Paymaster-General, reported the soldiers' deposits for the year ending June 30, 1878, as $346,243.94. This sum had been laid up by 5,524 men, or about one-fourth of all the enlisted men. The average for that year, which was $62 68 for each depositor, was greater by eleven dollars than that for the whole six years since the act passed. The number of desertions, also (1,672), in that year was less than in any previous year since the close of the war. Up to that time the deposits and interest had aggregated more than two millions. Three-fourths of a million remained on interest, and the rest had been disbursed to discharged soldiers, giving them a good start in civil life. Four years later, says the Secretary of War, "the enlisted men continue to a large extent to avail themselves of the deposit system, which it is believed encourages habits of economy and checks desertion." During the ten years it had been in operation the deposits had amounted to well-nigh four millions, more than one-fourth of which was still drawing interest. On the whole, Secretary Lincoln declared the experiment a signal success, and begged Congress to allow the officers to share in its benefits with enlisted men. Holding it good policy to encourage small deposits, he recommended that interest be allowed from its date on the minimum deposit, which is $5. Alvord saw the desire of his heart before going to his final rest.

—The death, in 1879, of that profound scholar and clear-headed statesman, Jón Sigurdsson, apparently left no one capable of filling his place as head of the Copenhagen section of the Icelandic Literary Society (Bókmentafèlag), an organization which, under his direction, became a centre of intellectual activity, and gave to the limited public which it served a continuous and carefully edited (if somewhat restricted) series of useful publications. The chauvinistic debates which followed his demise, relative to the transfer of the funds and collections of the Copenhagen section to Reykjavík, as well as the lack of efficacious executive control, have contributed to the cessation of the Society's old energy. Meanwhile a younger generation of Icelandic writers is coming on, and is seeking new avenues of publicity. The most prominent and promising of these are perhaps Björn Magnússen Ólsen and Thorvaldur Thoroddsen, both professors in the flourishing college at Reykjavík. The former was born in 1850, graduated at the college in 1869, and spent the next ten years at the University of Copenhagen and in travel, visiting even the countries of the Mediterranean. In 1879 he was appointed to his present chair, and by universal accord is regarded as the ultimate successor of the college's venerated rector, Dr. Jón Thorkelsson. Ólsen's first notable publication was in Danish, appearing as a separate reprint from the *Aarböger* of the Royal Society of Northern Antiquaries of Copenhagen in 1878. It comprised some acute observations on the chronology of Olaf Tryggvason's reign ('Kronologiske Bemærkninger om Olaf Tryggvason's Regeringshistorie'), and attracted the general notice of Scandinavian historical students. Soon after his return to Reykjavík he began to contribute to various periodicals, such as the *Árbók* of the Icelandic Archæological Society, the *Timarit*, a quarterly issued by the Reykjavík section of the Literary Society, Karl Bartsch's *Germania*, and the Norwegian *Archiv for nordisk Filologi*—his articles being either of an antiquarian or of a linguistic character, and always evincing mature scholarship. In 1883 the Arna-magnæan Commission published his 'Runerne i den oldislandske Literatur,' an exhaustive inquiry into the use of the Runic letters in Iceland during the saga period and before the introduction of the Latin alphabet. It was an ingenious effort, and showed, as do all of Ólsen's writings, an easy, fresh, and limpid style, and a logical and lucid arrangement of his material. To this succeeded, a year later, his best and largest work, likewise in Danish, brought out by the Copenhagen "Samfund til vdgivelse af gammel nordisk Literatur." It is an edition of the last two of the four ancient grammatical treatises which have come down to us as a part of that singular manual of skaldic verse known as the younger or prose Edda—Snorri Sturluson's Edda. The introduction is a systematic account of the grammatical literature of the 12th-14th centuries, Icelandic and foreign, so far as either illustrates the works under consideration. The texts of the two essays—the author of the first being Thórdr Sturluson (born about 1212), a member of Iceland's most illustrious family and nephew of Snorri, while the second is ascribed to Bergr Sokkason, who became abbot of the convent of Thverá in 1325—are based upon all the existing codices, and are accompanied by notes citing the sources consulted by the writers. These are principally the institutes of Priscian and the rudimentary syntactical rules which bear the name of Donatus, and, for the later treatise, the 'Doctrinale' of Alexander de Villa Dei and the 'Græcismus' of Ebrardus. Careful interpretations of the skaldic verses quoted as examples by the grammarians, and valuable indexes, complete what may be characterized as a model of text-editing. The same "Samfund" has now in press a similar edition by Ólsen of the 'Reykholtsmáldagi,' a valuable cartulary of the thirteenth century. Professor Ólsen has utilized the last two long vacations of summer in making excursions into various portions of Iceland for the purpose of collecting words and studying dialectic variations, with a view to the compilation of a complete grammar and lexicon of the new Icelandic. This field, in consequence of the engrossing interest of the old language and its literature, has hitherto been lamentably neglected.

—Thorvaldur Thoroddsen is a novel apparition in the literature of his native country—the first Icelandic scientist; for the title, in its broadest sense, can hardly be applied to either Björn Gunnlaugsson or the Hjaltalíns, who were virtually his sole predecessors. Born in 1855, he is a son of Jón Thoroddsen, author of 'Piltur og Stúlka,' the only strikingly original work of fiction yet produced in the island—a half-idyllic, half-humorous, but wholly faithful picture of Icelandic manners, which is constantly read and reread at home, and has been translated into Danish, Swedish, and German. Young Thoroddsen passed in 1875 from the Reykjavík College to the University of Copenhagen, where he devoted himself with great ardor to the natural sciences. Inheriting his father's literary facility, he became as early as 1878 a fertile contributor to various periodicals, among them the Icelandic *Andvari* and *Timarit*, the Danish *Geografisk Tidskrift*, the Swedish *Ymer*, and the proceedings of the Stockholm "Geologisk Forening," the London *Nature*, and the German Petermann's *Mittheilungen*. In these he has treated of the recent volcanic eruptions in Iceland, the lakes, mountains, and lava plains of the island, the effects of the Gulf Stream upon its coast-

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

line, vegetation and climate, the Greenlandic drift-ice, and many similar topics, always with the same astonishing thoroughness. Appointed in 1880 teacher of natural history in the technical school at Mödruvellir, he published in 1881 his 'Lysing Íslands,' which, though designed to be merely an elementary handbook to accompany a map prepared by a popular printing-club, is actually the best compact scientific description of Iceland. In the following year appeared at Copenhagen his 'Oversigt over de islandske Vulkaners Historie,' with maps, a bibliography, and a résumé in French, which threw a flood of light on the story of Iceland's thermal activity, and was reproduced in abstract by many of the geological and geographical journals of Europe. The Icelandic Althing, in the same year, made an appropriation for a natural history survey of the country, and intrusted its expenditure wholly to Thoroddsen. He accordingly spent the three following summers at work in different provinces, measuring heights, examining the endless heaths and tracts of lava, visiting glaciers and geysers, collecting plants, insects, geological specimens, correcting the maps of Iceland in innumerable particulars, discovering unknown valleys, lakes, and streams, and largely increasing the known flora, fauna, and mineral productions. As the results of his successive expeditions were partially made public, they aroused a general interest among European scientists, and Professor Lange and Count Strömfelt, of Copenhagen, Doctor Schierlitz, of Naples, and Doctor Schuster, of Vienna, with others, volunteered to relieve him in great part of the necessary laboratory work. His toilsome examination, in the warm months of 1884, of the immense lava desert (Ódádahraun) of Southern Iceland, possibly the most extensive in the world, and about which so much mystery and so many legends cluster, was a task rewarded by constantly occurring surprises. In a monograph of less than a hundred pages he has given a preliminary sketch of this land of black mists and gloomy tarns, of caverns and whitening bones, of whirlwinds of snow and storms of sand, of yawning craters and sulphurous morasses—the home of the *útilegumenn*, the fabled outlaws of the desert. The spring months of 1885 were passed in Leipsic, deducing and classifying his observations, and preparing for new journeys. During the summer he made a trip to Southern Italy to compare the volcanic structure, the sulphur-yielding *fumaroli*, and the hot springs of that region with those of Iceland, writing by the way a series of descriptive letters for a Reykjavík journal. In the meantime he had been transferred from the Mödruvellir School to the National College, and the Althing of this year had voted a liberal sum for the continuance of his investigations, which are ultimately to be embodied in a work embracing several volumes.

LOWE'S BISMARCK.

Prince Bismarck: An Historical Biography. By Charles Lowe, M.A. Vol. I. From Waterloo to Versailles. Vol. II. The German Empire. Cassell & Co. 1886.

It would not be easy to find an historic character whose career, superficially regarded, displays more inconsistencies than that of Prince Bismarck. When he first appears in public life, at the age of thirty-two, he is a Tory of the Tories, a champion of the divine right of kings, strenuous in his opposition to every grant of political power to the people. He is the admirer and defender of Austria, because Austria is the chief bulwark of European conservatism. Within less than twenty years, this Austrophil forces a reluctant king and a protesting people into war with Austria; this advocate of *jure divino* sovereignty despoils three German princes of their crowns; this enemy of popular liberty establishes a German Parliament based upon manhood suffrage. Not less striking is his change of front upon numerous minor questions. In 1847, for example, Bismarck is opposed, upon religious grounds, to the emancipation of the Jews and to civil marriage; upon economic grounds, to artificially stimulating the industries of the nation. In 1869 he accepts a law abolishing all religious disabilities; in 1873 he supports a law establishing compulsory civil marriages; and in 1879 he carries through Parliament a protective tariff.

But, given the true point of view, the careful student of Bismarck's career will find it thoroughly consistent. Every act of Bismarck's official life, from his appointment in 1851 to represent Prussia at Frankfort, has been in perfect accord with a single dominant motive—the establishment of a strong Germany under the hegemony of Prussia. With him all other purposes have been secondary to this; and to this supreme end all inconsistent secondary aims, however dear to him, have been sacrificed. His minor aims have never influenced even the choice of the means by which his chief end was to be accomplished. Bismarck entered public life with as many and as firmly-rooted opinions and prejudices as any educated man of his time. There is no evidence that he has changed his opinions or abandoned his prejudices upon any important matter. There is abundant evidence to the contrary. But, however strong his predisposition, it seems never to have colored his view of any practical question. Given a thing to do, he has always seen and chosen the best—*i. e.*, the most efficient—means of doing it. Such perfect mental achromatism arouses in the ordinary mind a mixed feeling of admiration and repulsion. The latter emotion finds expression in charges of inconsistency and unscrupulousness; both feelings are blended in the French reproach of Bismarck as a "realist."

The history of such a man should be written objectively, without zeal and without hate, as the plans and achievements of Cæsar Borgia—no comparison between Bismarck and Borgia being intended—were described by Machiavelli. To praise or to blame is alike dangerous, particularly when the man whose deeds are described stands so near the historian. It cannot be said that Mr. Lowe has written such a biography. He is visibly under the charm of Bismarck's genius. But he has come nearer to writing such a book than any of the Chancellor's previous biographers; for these have written either from a German or from an anti-German point of view—*i. e.*, either with unbounded zeal or ill-disguised hate. Mr. Lowe has the advantage of his nationality. An Englishman is less touched by the warring political interests of Europe than any other European, and is to just that extent better able to describe impartially the career of the man who has changed the face of the Continent.

But however impartial the writer, a wholly satisfactory life of Bismarck cannot be written until the historian obtains the original material which is still secreted in the state-archives of Germany and its neighbors. It is probable that the greater part of this material will remain inaccessible for half a century. The recent publication of Bismarck's despatches from Frankfort (1851-59) was generally regarded as a breach of diplomatic usage, although the events of 1866 had made the affairs of the old Federal Diet ancient history. For the period since 1859 we have only isolated state papers, made public by chance or for special purposes. Fortunately for the historian, Bismarck has always regarded the publication of his own and his enemies' correspondence as a most efficient instrument of diplomatic warfare, and has availed himself of such arms more freely than the traditions of diplomacy authorize. To this we owe the publication of Benedetti's notes and drafts of treaties (1866-67), of Bismarck's notes to the Curia in 1880, and of the English-German correspondence on colonial matters in 1884. In his speeches, also, Bismarck has frequently astonished the German Diet and the European courts with disclosures of singular frankness. Finally, Bismarck's publications and speeches have regularly called forth counter-revelations of a more or less interesting character. Mr. Lowe has made diligent study and excellent use of all this material, and, so far as we can see, of all other sources of information; and has given, on the whole, a clearer and more intelligible history of Bismarck's public life than any of the Prince's other biographers.

Bismarck's youth and early manhood (chapter i), and his parliamentary career (chapters ii and iii) are described with judiciously sparing use of the numerous anecdote-biographies produced by German admirers. His diplomatic activity at Frankfort (chapter iv) and at St. Petersburg and Paris (chapter v) is set forth with due subordination of the minor details to the point of central importance—his growing hostility to Austria, and his preparations for an anti-Austrian policy. With his acceptance of the Minister-Presidency of Prussia (1862) begins the "conflict-time" (chapters vi and vii). The author employs this phrase in a wider sense than the accepted usage justifies. By the "Confliktzeit" Germans mean the period during which Bismarck, confronted by a parliamentary majority which did not understand his aims and to which he could not explain them, governed, in defiance of the spirit and intent of the Constitution, without a budget. The fact that the Danish and Austrian wars fall in the same period does not, according to the accepted meaning of the word, make these wars a part of the (constitutional) "Conflikt."

Mr. Lowe's description of the Schleswig-Holstein imbroglio is clear and accurate, but he fails to see, or at least to make the reader see, how much of the darkness surrounding this famous question is due to the tortuous policy of the Prussian Minister-President, and in particular to the way in which he played fast and loose with the London Treaty of 1852. His object, of course, was to get possession of the duchies, and to do this he had to shut out both the Danish and Augustenburg claimants. To exclude Denmark, it was necessary to repudiate the London Treaty; to exclude the Augustenburg prince, it was necessary to recognize it. The London settlement was therefore recognized at the beginning of the war, repudiated during the negotiations for peace, and set up again, after the cession of the duchies to Prussia and Austria, as the legal basis of their (derivative) title.

In describing the attitude of Napoleon III. before and during the Austrian war of 1866, our author fails to recognize that the French Emperor was actuated by any but the most practical and materialistic considerations. It is doubtless true that Napoleon thought Austria stronger than Prussia, and believed that the extension of Prussian influence in Germany would create a more perfect balance of power. It is doubtless true that he expected some reward from Prussia for his support—something in the way of a German Savoy. But it is also true that Napoleon was in part controlled by more idealistic motives. The author of the 'Idées Napoléoniennes' believed in the reorganization of Europe according to the "principle of nationality," and thought that it would be better for France to help on this inevitable result than to oppose it. This side of the Emperor's policy has been most clearly brought out by Leroy-Beaulieu, in his 'L'Empereur Napoléon III. et la Politique du Second Empire.' The fact that the two sides of Napoleon's policy were absolutely and fatally antago-

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

nistic—that the attempt to gain territorial cessions from a unified Germany would bring him into immediate conflict with the "principle of nationality" and the new nation—this fact does not make it any the less true that Napoleon remained half politician and half dreamer until roughly awakened by Sadowa, and that the Napoleonic dreams formed an important element in Bismarck's calculations.

In Mr. Lowe's account of the Prussian negotiations with France and the South-German States after Sadowa, he misses one of the cleverest and most characteristic points of Bismarck's diplomacy. France demanded the improvement of her eastern frontier by the cession of Prussian and South-German territory. Benedetti put the French propositions into writing on the 5th of August. Bismarck negotiated with the South-German States with Benedetti's propositions in his pocket. He demanded at first not only heavy war-indemnities but considerable cessions of territory. The South-German States appealed to France for protection, and the French Government directed Benedetti to use his good offices in their behalf. Bismarck thereupon revealed to the Bavarian plenipotentiary (Von der Pfordten) the fact that Benedetti had asked Prussia to consent to the seizure by France of the entire Bavarian palatinate. This revelation was accompanied by the offer of an offensive and defensive alliance, and a great reduction of Prussia's previous demands. Confronted with conclusive evidence of France's perfidy, the South-German States had no alternative; they accepted the Prussian terms (August 22). Mr. Lowe entirely confounds cause and effect in his account of these negotiations. He makes it appear that Bismarck, alarmed by the French demands, sought alliances with the South-German States, and to obtain these alliances materially modified his terms of peace. But that these alliances were obtained by the revelation of the French demands—this he does not seem to know.

In the remaining chapters of the first volume the author describes the organization of the North-German Confederation, the increasing tension between Prussia and France, and the Franco-German war. The second volume treats of the foreign and domestic policy of the Chancellor from the establishment of the Empire to the spring of 1885. The events described are of less dramatic interest than those narrated in the first volume, but not of less importance; and this part of Mr. Lowe's work is the more valuable because no other English book covers the same ground. In this, as in the preceding volume, the author shows a familiarity with German politics which can have been acquired only by long residence in Germany, and which greatly increases the value of his book. Very naïve, however, is the remark made in the preface, that "when any constitutional controversy is agitating the Parliaments of Berlin," English readers need only turn to the translations of the Prussian and Imperial Constitutions (printed in the appendix) in order to "at once perceive on which side lies the balance of right and wrong." Were Mr. Lowe's nationality otherwise in doubt, this sentence would reveal it. Only in a land governed by unwritten usage is such faith to be found in the certainty of written law.

The author seems to be perfectly familiar with the German language. We have found him at fault but once; and then the German idiom is veiled in dog-Latin:

"'The King,' said Bismarck one day, 'still has his difficulties between "German Emperor" and "Emperor of Germany," but he rather inclines to the latter. I cannot see much difference between the two. It is a little like the question of the Homousians and the Homoioousians, in the days of the Councils.' On another occasion, when the conversation drifted into a learned discussion on the same subject, Bismarck asked: 'Does any gentleman know the Latin for sausage?' '*Farcimentum*,' replied one. '*Farcimen*,' said another. '*Farcimentum* or *farcimen*, whichever you please,' said the chief, smiling; '*nescio quid mihi magis farcimentum esset*' (I don't know which of the two I should consider the more made-up name)" (Vol. I., p. 613.)

If Mr. Lowe had first translated Bismarck's Latin back into the German in which Bismarck was thinking, he would then, doubtless, have seen the meaning of the sentence. "Ich weiss nicht welches (von den Beiden) mir mehr Wurst wäre" means "I don't know which of the two is *more indifferent to me*."

Mr. Lowe's familiarity with the German language is in fact so great that it has bred in him an apparent contempt for his own, which he disfigures with numerous Teutonisms; *e. g.*, "had the *brow* to argue," "all but opening a *pulse-vein*," and other similar expressions. The author's English is often exceedingly faulty, and his style is at times turgid and at other times overcolloquial. Occasionally he shows that he can express himself tersely and clearly, and that the prevailing viciousness of his style is due to carelessness. It can be nothing but carelessness when Bismarck is described as quoting "*Wheatstone* and Kent." "Wheatstone" appears to be a composite mental photograph of Wheaton and Story. Mr. Lowe's carelessness about his diction and about such little matters as the name of a great American jurist is the more unfortunate because the reader is always inclined to infer that a carelessly written book is not likely to have been carefully prepared. In this case the inference would be unjust. Mr. Lowe has studied the sources of information at present available with great care; has arranged and presented the results of his investigation with no little art and skill; and has written not merely a very readable book, but a very creditable history of Bismarck and his times.

BANCROFT'S ALASKA.

The Works of Hubert Howe Bancroft. History of Alaska. 1730-1885. Vol. xxxiii, 8vo, xxxviii, 773 pp. San Francisco: A. L. Bancroft & Co.; New York: J. C. Derby & Son. 1886.

THE task set himself by Mr. Bancroft, beginning with his 'Native Races' and continued in the historical series of which this volume forms a part, is truly prodigious. His methods are not concealed, and, whether they be deemed adequate to the production of the best type of historical work or not, it would be difficult to devise other methods by which his desired result could be attained within the compass of a lifetime. The elimination of the personal equation of subordinate compilers must always be a task of difficulty, and upon success in this particular the homogeneity and literary quality of the product must depend. When, as in the present instance, the rough-hewing of much of the material has necessarily been confided to one pair of hands, a Russian translator, the personal equation becomes an element which fairly forces itself upon the analytical reviewer. Its effect upon the work, beneficial, or otherwise, will be considered later. Putting this aside, there can be no question as to the value and importance of the volume for all engaged in historical studies, and especially when the lapse of time shall have given an historical perspective to the later scenes of its panorama.

Mr. Bancroft remarks in the preface—"Almost untenanted except by savages, can a country without a people furnish material for a history?" a question which he answers: "This America of the Russians has its little century or two of history, . . . interesting to the story of future life and progress on its borders, as to every nation its infancy should be." Can we paint in a few bold strokes the initiation and the impact of the premonitory groundswell of civilization on these rock-bound shores? It began, like the earthquake waves of Krakatoa, in a far-distant land. The interests and passions involved in the conquest of Siberia, the flood of patriotism, avarice, ambition, duty, lust, and the spirit of adventure—embodied in a horde of coarse and sturdy Cossacks—its sluices shattered by the sword of Yermak, swept eastward across half a world of tundra, and only culminated on the further borders of the North Pacific. Arrived at the Kamtchatkan seaboard, the return of the enfeebled remnants of Bering's expedition gave the signal to which the Siberian traders responded like an advancing column of predatory ants. In frail shallops, tied together with strips of raw hide and calked with moss, they pushed out into the almost unknown sea to the islands of the sea otter and fur seal. Blood and rapine marked their tracks. Individuals or whole companies bit the dust beneath the darts of the savage, hurled in desperate but ineffectual resistance. But the progress of the column was not stayed. Fortunes were grasped, of which ocean, by shipwreck, took toll. With success came internal conflict; as the supply of fur animals became precarious, different expeditions fought for territory. The craft of the merchant took up its rôle of conciliator, or monopolizer, and the power of law, the influence of rulers, began to make itself felt. Exploring expeditions were organized, information reached high places, the Russian American Company came into existence by imperial will. This great monopoly, like its counterparts in Hudson Bay or the East Indies, represented another stage of the tide, with myriad fluctuations. It found its Warren Hastings in Alexander Baranoff, a bankrupt Siberian trader, who for thirty years controlled its destinies. Shrewd, far-sighted, energetic, unsparing of himself in service, liberal in potations, coarse of life, but of unshaken probity, this man raised towns and villages, fought savages and mutinous Russians, built a fleet of sea-going ships, established stations from Bering Sea to California; would, but for mishaps, have annexed the Sandwich Islands; laid a basis for trade with American and Asiatic ports, enabled the regular payment of dividends by his company, and died at Batavia on his way to Russia, poor and superseded, in his seventy-second year.

To the natural difficulties of his position were added the scarcity of supplies, often cut off by shipwreck; innumerable quarrels of subordinates; difficulties with imperial officials bent on reforms, or with missionary priests hardly less coarse-fibred than himself, and the insulting conduct of naval officers to him as a man not ennobled. Foreign traders came upon the coast, largely from the United States, and carried off cargoes of valuable furs, besides raising prices. In the main, this indomitable man conquered his way, and, rude and brutal as he was at times, must be acknowledged to have been of no ordinary calibre. After Baranoff's reign the internal affairs of the company were much after the usual rule of great monopolies. Reforms were instituted; a better class of officers improved the colonial direction. Explorations of a rude sort were carried far and wide. A saint, large-hearted and of mighty frame, appeared in the person of the missionary Veniaminoff. Naval officers and naturalists enlarged the boundaries of knowledge. The scientific Wrangell governed wisely and investigated widely. Annual ships circumnavigated the globe, and, after a fashion, the pulse of Cronstadt was felt at New Archangel. Politics concerned with the northwest coast

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

were discussed in Europe and reacted on colonial affairs. Foreign exploring expeditions followed the lead of Cook and Vancouver. An impracticable boundary line was devised by treaty. Trade fluctuated; charges of mismanagement were frequent at court. In brief, after investigations and recriminations, terms offered and declined, the charter of the Company lapsed in 1862 and was not renewed. Business was carried on for a few more years, and in 1867 the Territory became the property of the United States.

The list of authorities preceding the text of this volume, though bibliographically somewhat slovenly, is full enough for most purposes, and is especially rich in MS. titles. From these, and from a host of original Russian sources, the history of the early adventurers has been extracted with remarkable fulness. There is not in any European language so thorough and minute a record of this period, and it is never likely to be much improved upon. There may be inaccuracies, but the original sources are frequently inaccurate. Moreover, with rare exceptions, the story is well told, and one does not need a microscope to perceive that the compiler has felt a personal pride in the sturdy endurance of his countrymen. For any one not interested in the region, the annals of these multitudinous petty expeditions soon become tedious; but the spirit shown in the narration has made readable even this chronicle of misery, adventure, and crime. The struggles of Baranoff with adverse fortune enlist the sympathies of the reader, but at last the small details of the Company's business become almost repellant. Nevertheless, it is a task on the whole well accomplished, and that this storehouse of facts should have been gathered and presented in a readable tongue is highly creditable to the historian and his staff.

It would seem, from the manner in which the work has been done, that Mr. Bancroft's plan did not contemplate a comprehensive history of the exploration of Alaska, or at least not in this volume. Only on this hypothesis can we account for the omission or barely casual mention of some of the more important voyages of discovery and exploring expeditions by land. The North Pacific exploring expedition under Rodgers, the long series of Franklin search expeditions, which added so much to our knowledge of the region, are only referred to where they touch upon Russian affairs, if at all. The Western Union Telegraph expedition, so important in its results, not only for its relation to exploration, but its bearing on the subsequent purchase and development of the Territory, is dismissed in three pages—a space less than that assigned to the discussion of some petty blackmailers of the Alaska Commercial Company. Many later explorers fare still worse.

That part of the work referring to the history of the Territory since the American occupation is treated in a most unsatisfactory manner and with evident bias. It is in any event rather too near the present time for successful treatment, and had better have been omitted. A large mass of facts has been collected, but their sequence and relation to each other and to the circumstances of the time are not indicated in a satisfactory way, and there are many important omissions and not a few errors. Of the latter we indicate a portion. The naturalist, Robert Kennicott, in charge of the Yukon explorations, did not die before the expedition set out (p. 576), but in May, 1866, after it had been in the field some nine months. A statement by W. G. Morris, to the effect that in 1868 there were four or five companies engaged in sealing on the Pribiloff Islands, that the commander of one of them would not work his men on Sunday, etc., is ridiculed (p. 637, note 14), and it is stated that there were but two companies in the business. The truth is, that in August, 1868, the Pioneer Fur Co., Taylor & Bendel, and Hutchinson, Kohl & Co., together with parties left by a fourth expedition, were sealing on St. George, represented severally by Messrs. Fisher, Adams, Liuneffski, and Howes; while on the island of St. Paul, Hutchinson, Kohl & Co. and E. Morgan, the latter assisted by Mr. Pfluger, of Petropavlovsk, were in operation. Captain Morgan was the person who would not work his men on Sunday. A number of these parties subsequently united their interests, but this did not take place until later, and they all landed on the islands as independent expeditions in the spring of 1868. The first paper printed in Alaska was called the *Alaska Times*, and not (p. 677) the *Sitka Times*. No new island rose from the sea north of Umnak in 1820, or thereabouts (p. 684), and the statement, by Peter Kostromittinoff, "an octogenarian," in 1880, that he witnessed an event which took place in 1796, was doubtless due to a failure of memory on his part, which, as stated in the footnote (No. 28), "will not bear quoting." No mention is made of the Territorial Convention of August 16, 1881, followed by the election, September 5, of a delegate, Col. M. D. Ball, to represent the interests of the Territory at Washington, which, as the first united action of the white inhabitants of Alaska, has certainly an historic interest.

On page 732 we read as follows: "The middle Yukon, as far as the junction of that river with the Porcupine and the Lower Yukon, extending from this point to the delta, had already been explored, as we have seen (*sic*), by the servants of the Russian American Company, who occasionally ascended the stream from the direction of St. Michael, sometimes possibly as far as the present site of Fort Reliance, and thence made their way partly overland to the Lynn Canal." No evidence is offered for this statement, and it is doubtless without authentic foundation. No servant of the Russian American Company ever ascended above Fort Yukon, and only one, a half-breed (Ivan Lukeen), ever ascended above the junction of the Yukon and the Tananah. The uncivil allusion to Lieutenant Schwatka in this connection is entirely unwarranted by any Russian explorations. The intimation that the liquor commonly called "hoochinoo" was introduced by the Americans, is also an error. It was well known to the Russians long before the sale of the Territory, and a regulation of the Russian American Company imposed a penalty on any one of their servants who should make it.

A rock of difficulty for any one dealing with Alaskan matters exists in the transliteration of the Russian nomenclature. In the present case, Mr. Bancroft is to be congratulated for the, on the whole, very satisfactory manner in which this task has been accomplished. The only constant error we have noticed is the omission of the *h* in Unalashka. Occasional lapses are found, as on p. 684, where we have *Oumnak*, *Unalaska*, and *Oonimak* in the course of six lines, but these are creditably rare. The endeavor to transliterate exactly, which adopts Petr for Peter and Pavel for Paul, should hardly admit Wrangell for Vrangel on the same basis.

The maps in the text are fairly good, but the general Alaskan map is not worthy of the text; its nomenclature is discrepant; it contains several glaring blunders; in omitting the Diomede Islands, the Kowak River, and all the later explorations, it is lamentably out of date. This is probably due in part to its having been engraved some years before the text was completed.

DR. F. E. ABBOT'S PHILOSOPHY.

Organic Scientific Philosophy: Scientific Theism. By Francis Ellingwood Abbot, Ph.D. Boston: Little, Brown & Co. 1885.

Dr. Abbot is one of the many thinkers who believe that science is destined to produce a theism, and he belongs also to the smaller number who think that it is already possible to say what that doctrine shall be. Considerably more than half of his 'Scientific Theism' is taken up with the proof that the world is intelligible; but this lengthy and metaphysical argumentation will convince nobody for whom very simple considerations would not have sufficed. How is it that one who believes he has the message of a new religion to announce to humanity should choose so roundabout a way of setting it forth? The following is one of the author's own summaries of his line of argument:

"1. Because the universe is in some measure actually known in human science, it must be in itself both absolutely self-existent and infinitely intelligible: that is, it must be a noumenon because it is a phenomenon.

"2. Because it is infinitely intelligible, it must be likewise infinitely intelligent.

"3. Because it is at the same time both infinitely intelligible and infinitely intelligent, it must be an infinite subject-object or self-conscious intellect.

"4. Because it is an infinitely intelligible object, it must possess throughout an immanent relational constitution.

"5. Because it possesses an infinitely intelligible relational constitution, it must be an absolutely perfect system.

"6. Because it is an absolutely perfect system, it cannot be an infinite machine, but must be an infinite organism.

"7. Because it is an infinite organism, its life principle must be an infinite immanent Power, acting everywhere and always by organic means for organic ends, and subordinating every event to its own infinite life: in other words, it must be infinite Will directed by infinite Wisdom.

"8. Because it is an infinite organism, its exient organic end disappears as such, but reappears as infinite Love of itself and infinite Love of the finite.

"9. Because it is an infinite organism, its immanent organic end appears as the eternal realization of the ideal, and therefore as infinite Holiness.

"10. Because, as an infinite organism, it thus manifests infinite Wisdom, Power, and Goodness, or thought, feeling, and will in their infinite fulness, and because these three constitute the essential manifestations of personality, it must be conceived as Infinite Person, Absolute Spirit, Creative Source, and Eternal Home of the derivative finite personalities which depend upon it, but are no less real than itself."

If this last conclusion really follows from the original premise, why need the proof have been so long? It is not like a geometrical demonstration, where there is a complicated diagram, every part of which has to be separately considered. In this case the premise is as simple a fact as can be—that something is known; the conclusion that the universe is an infinite person is also not very complex, and the intricacy of the argument to connect them affords ground for a suspicion that there is a fallacy somewhere. It would be a flattery of metaphysics to say that its history gives any warrant for holding that no more than one deduction in ten as plausible as the above turns out to be fallacious; and therefore the probability that there is no fallacy in the whole of the above chain of ten consequences is only 9-10ths to the tenth power, which is about 1-3. In advance of the verdict of posterity, then, the odds are two to one against Dr. Abbot's argument being sound. The subtlety of Nature, as Bacon says, far exceeds that of the human mind, and has a way of eluding our *must-bes*. To look no further than Dr. Abbot's first consequence, may it not be that nature is sufficiently intelligible to account for the degree of success that natural science has met with, without being necessarily *infinitely* intelligible?

The religion of the book seems to be only an appendage to a system of metaphysics. Whether true or false, this system is certainly valuable as presenting Objectivism, or the doctrine of an existence over against thought, in its extremest form. Its most striking philosophical charac-

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

teristic is an energetic dualism. It makes the fundamental doctrines of philosophy consist in distinctions, crystalline, sharp, and unyielding; and the oppositions of things to which these distinctions refer go down to the bottom of being. The appearance and the thing are sundered by an impassable gulf, and the element of concrete outward reaction in sense and volition is much more emphasized than in other philosophical theories. The same spirit affects the author's whole style of thought and writing, which is clear and hard, and impels him to destroy every opposing tendency of thought "root and branch," instead of imitating other recent revolutionizers of philosophy in wishing to show that the error need only to receive complete development in order to be turned to the truth. Everything like uniting the members of his main distinctions by insensible gradations, by a deeper underlying unity, or by any mediating cause, except the Divine Mind which creates the relations but not the related things, is foreign to his idea.

Dr. Abbot holds that things, as they are known to physical science, possess absolute existence in themselves, not relative to or dependent upon thought of any kind. He holds that the relations of these things are hard facts, equally independent of all thought. There seems, however, to be some vagueness in his theory of relations, for on page 28 he seems to say that relations are something over and above the related things—"things and relations constitute two great distinct orders of objective reality"; while on page 63 we are told that "the affirmation of the objectivity of the relation [must not be misconceived] as an affirmation that the relation is an entity apart from the things it relates." He holds that relations inhere in groups; but whether the existence of these groups consists in the existence of the relations, or the existence of the relations consists in that of the groups, or whether groups form a third order of reality distinct alike from things and relations, he does not inform us. And it will be one of his difficulties that his system, from the nature of it, at once opens a multitude of questions of this sort, the consideration of which cannot be shirked. The author is so remarkably loath to admit mediation that he will not admit there is any such thing as a symbolical conception (p. 139):

"The universal notion, or concept proper, is a pure thought-system of relations, reproducing only the objective system of relations of resemblance among many individuals—never the image or mental picture of one individual."

The doctrine seems to be that the relations are reproduced, without being embodied in any diagram, as "concepts of relations, dropping out of consideration the things related." The knowledge of relations depends upon a special "perceptive use of the understanding." This view, although it is not adequately set forth, is the centre of all that is original in the book, and is sure to excite a fruitful discussion of the question of the mode of our discernment of relations. Of all the sciences—at least of those whose reality no one disputes—mathematics is the one which deals with relations in the abstractest form; and it never deals with them except as embodied in a diagram or construction, geometrical or algebraical. The mathematical study of a construction consists in experimenting with it; after a number of such experiments, their separate results suddenly become united in one rule, and our immediate consciousness of this rule is our discernment of the relation. It is a strong secondary sensation, like the sense of beauty. To call it a perception may perhaps be understood as implying that to discern each special relation requires a special faculty, or determination of our nature. But it should not be overlooked that we come to it by a process analogous to induction.

The one great argument which Doctor Abbot uses to support his "noumenism," as he calls it, is that the existence of natural science supposes it. But the physicist always talks and thinks of phenomena or appearances, and makes not the slightest pretension to have anywhere got down to the noumena, bottom facts, or ultimate subjects of appearances. He discovers, for instance, that air is viscous, and viscosity is a non-conservative force. It is a reality; but yet, according to the physicist, only a phenomenal reality. Matter in itself is not viscous: but this phenomenon is due to the air being composed of countless molecules moving very rapidly in nearly rectilinear paths. These molecules themselves are not necessarily the bottom subjects; they may be mere systems of atoms, which in turn may be merely phenomena due to the vortex-motions of an underlying fluid. This fluid may come to be studied in time, and physicists will be quite prepared to learn that it again is only phenomenal. The physicist certainly holds that he reaches real facts, which no more depend upon anybody's thought of them for their existence than the coach in the fable depended on the fly for its motion. For example, he holds this to be true of the laws of the mixture of colors. These laws are realities, which remain what they are whatever our opinions about them may be. But to say this, is not to say that the colors themselves are anything more than appearances. Further, although science must hold the facts it discovers to be independent of the opinion of any person or persons, it by no means follows that it need insist on their being independent of the final upshot of sufficient investigation, nor that it need hold them to be independent of the creative thought of the Deity. As yet, science does not decide either for or against any of the current systems of philosophy. Some are undoubtedly more in harmony with its spirit than others; but we can hardly reckon among the former a theory so averse to the conceptions of the differential calculus, and so prone to hard and discrete distinctions, as the one we have noticed. It is, however, a strongly characterized and scholarly piece of work, doing honor to American thought; and it is much to be desired that the world should see the system developed in its entirety.

Myrtilla Miner: a Memoir. By Ellen M. O'Connor. Boston: Houghton, Mifflin & Co. 1885.

The Story of Archer Alexander: From Slavery to Freedom, March 30, 1863. By William G. Eliot. Boston: Cupples, Upham & Co. 1885.

THESE two monographs may be read where larger histories of the anti-slavery epoch would pass unheeded, and each will serve to excite the reader's wonder and pity, and to strengthen his humane instincts. Miss Miner was a native of this State—a New Englander "once removed," as we may say, her father having been born in Norwich, Conn. She educated herself with the greatest resolution and the greatest difficulty, both on account of her poverty and of her frail physique, and began to teach, first at the North and afterward, for a short time, at the South, where she imbibed a horror of slavery. Mrs. O'Connor leaves much to be desired (by herself as well as by her readers, we dare say) in precision of dates, but, as well as we can make out, an interval of seventeen years elapsed between her return from Mississippi and her first steps toward setting up a school in 1851 in the District of Columbia for free colored children. The hardihood of this attempt can be realized only by those who have paid some attention to anti-slavery history, and Miss Miner necessarily encountered bitter opposition and no little persecution. Her case has been likened to Prudence Crandall's, and there was some similarity in their treatment, though Miss Miner's was the milder, and in place of a Quaker non-resistance she was prepared to defend herself with arms, and let herself be "seen practising shooting with a pistol," and again at an open window with a pointed revolver. In time, the benevolent came to her support and gave her enterprise a solid backing, and in 1863 the school was made an incorporated institution, and is now the flourishing Miner Normal School and a part of the colored school system of the District. It marks the gain to Washington which the war and freedom brought, that the square of ground purchased by Miss Miner in 1853 for $4,000 was sold in 1872 by the corporators for $40,000. Unhappily an accident on the Pacific coast in 1864 proved fatal to the heroic founder.

Dr. Eliot, a revered clergyman of St. Louis, bases his narrative, at once charming and pathetic, on the bronze group in Washington representing Lincoln emancipating a kneeling slave, of which a replica is set up in Boston. This slave is a portrait of Archer Alexander, "as correct as that of Mr. Lincoln himself," and Archer was "the last fugitive slave captured under civil law in Missouri." Dr. Eliot's narrative possesses absorbing interest, and in a literary point of view merits high praise. He closes it with chapters on slavery in the Border States and on Elijah P. Lovejoy, illustrating his general statement that, "notwithstanding the comparative humanity of slavery as an institution in Missouri, I can truthfully say that there is nothing in all the scenes of 'Uncle Tom's Cabin,' as given by Mrs. Stowe, to which I cannot find a parallel in what I have myself seen and known in St. Louis itself, previously to the war of secession." An appendix recalls the declarations of Methodist, Baptist, and Presbyterian churches "that the separation of husband and wife under the laws of slavery, by the removal of either party, was to be regarded as 'civil death,' sundering the bonds, and leaving both parties free to make another marriage contract." On the irregular authorization of the Western Sanitary Commission by General Frémont, Dr. Eliot remarks: "It is my confident opinion, from familiarity with all the facts at the time, that it his emancipation order had been equally sustained, notwithstanding its alleged irregularity, instead of being countermanded with censure, the State of Missouri would have been saved from more than two years of destructive guerilla warfare."

BOOKS OF THE WEEK.

Amiel's Journal. Translated by Mrs. Humphry Ward. Macmillan & Co. $2.50.
Armstrong's Primer of English History, for School and Family Use. A. C. Armstrong & Son.
A Crimson Stain. Cassell & Co. 25 cents.
Bates, C. R. The Diacritical Speller. Syracuse: C. W. Bardeen. 50 cents.
Butler, F. G. History of Farmington, Me., from the Earliest Explorations to the Present Time. 1776-1885. Farmington: Knowlton, McLeary & Co.
Caron, P. French Dishes for American Tables. D. Appleton & Co. $1.
Clarke, J. F. Ten Great Religions. New ed. Boston: Houghton, Mifflin & Co. 2 vols. $4.
Davidson, J. W. The Correspondent. D. Appleton & Co. 60 cents.
Froude, J. A. Oceana: or, England and her Colonies. Charles Scribner's Sons. $2.50.
Genone, H. Inquirendo Island. G. P. Putnam's Sons. $1.50.
Greene, B. Reflections and Modern Maxims. G. P. Putnam's Sons. 75 cents.
Gillespie, Rev. C. G. K. Revision Reasons. I. The Pentateuch. London: John Heywood.
Gillig, C. A. New Guide to London. Chicago: Rand, McNally & Co.
Gneist, Dr. R. The History of the English Constitution. Translated by Philip A. Ashworth. 2 vols. G. P. Putnam's Sons. $8.
Gréville, H. Markof the Russian Violinist. Philadelphia: T. B. Peterson & Brothers.
Harley, Rev. T. Moon Lore. London: Sonnenschein: Philadelphia: J. B. Lippincott Co. $2.75.
Jacob Schuyler's Millions: A Novel. D. Appleton & Co. 50 cents.
Lee, S. L. Stories of Provence. From the French of Alphonse Daudet. Harper's Handy Series. 25 cents.
Lord, A. M. A Book of Verses. Boston: Cupples, Upham & Co.
Lotze, H. Outlines of Psychology. Translated by G. T. Ladd. Boston: Ginn & Co.
Lyman, H. M. Insomnia and Other Disorders of Sleep. Chicago: W. T. Keener.
Mother's Songs, Games, and Stories. Translated from Froebel by Frances and Emily Lord. London: William Rice & Co.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED